

METHODIST REVIEW

(BIMONTHLY)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, L.H.D., Editor

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. Is Joseph Forever Lost to Us as a Real Historic Person? <i>Professor Ed. König, D.D., University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany.</i>	345
II. The Average Sermon. <i>J. Wesley Johnston, D.D., New York, New York.</i>	351
III. The Seat of Authority in the Science of Theology. <i>President Charles J. Little, D.D., LL.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.</i>	365
IV. The Question of Biblical Criticism in the Roman Catholic Church. <i>Professor H. C. Sheldon, D.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.</i>	376
V. Our Episcopacy—A Study into the Doctrine of the Fathers. <i>Robert T. Miller, Esq., Cincinnati, Ohio.</i>	392
VI. The Social Resurrection of a Great People. <i>T. J. Scott, D.D., Bareilly, India.</i>	408
VII. Wesley's First Missionary, and His Visit to New England. <i>W. H. Meredith, D.D., Lynn, Massachusetts.</i>	413
VIII. Hugh Price Hughes: Evangelist. <i>J. B. Young, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio.</i>	419
IX. The Popularity of Burns's Poetry. <i>Walter B. Wilson, A.B., LL.B., New York, New York.</i>	430
X. Fiction and Fatalism. <i>Isaac Crook, D.D., Chillicothe, Ohio.</i>	438
XI. Church Federation for Saloon Suppression. <i>Professor J. M. Barker, Ph.D., Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.</i>	443

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

Notes and Discussions. <i>Shelley and Later Rationalists, 452; A Typical Scholar's Life, 454.</i>	451
The Arena. <i>Another View of Emerson, 466; Shall Faith Perish from off the Earth? 467; A Much Neglected Question of Conscience, 469; "Jefferson's Bible;" or, Thomas Jefferson's Life and Morals of Jesus, 471.</i>	466
The Itinerants' Club. <i>Suggestions about Bible Study, 475; The Melchizedek Priesthood (continued), 478.</i>	475
Archæology and Biblical Research. <i>Excavations at Herculaneum, 483; Delitzsch's Last Lecture, 483.</i>	480
Foreign Outlook.	484
Glimpses of Reviews and Magazines.	490
Book Notices.	494

NEW YORK
EATON & MAINS
CINCINNATI
JENNINGS & GRAHAM
Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter]



Bright Young People

and their older friends are sure to enjoy
the reading of

The House that Jack Built

By WESLEY JOHNSTON

An accomplished critic writes: "Wesley Johnston has written popular stories before, but nothing that he has written yet equals or surpasses this beautiful piece of fiction. The artistic grace, the literary skill, the pure, strong, simple English, and the sparkling wit for which this author is noted, all add to the charm of this rare story. All the characters in the book are real flesh-and-blood people whom you meet every day. 'Jack' himself is a great character, and well deserves the rewards that come to him. The situations are interesting and sometimes thrilling, especially that scene in the schoolroom. This is a fine bit of work."

12mo. Cloth, 75 cents net

Back to Bethlehem

By JOHN H. WILLEY, D.D.

Those interested in larger views of religion will find this book thought-provoking, a veritable seed-bed of ideas. As an interpretation of divine revelation it is fresh and stimulating. Written in a clear, terse style, it grips one's interest and holds it to the end; a book alive with the best thought of our day, and one that will have a wide reading.

12mo. Cloth, \$1 net

Burden-Bearing

By JOHN RHEY THOMPSON, D.D.

Dr. Thompson had a genius for preaching, and this collection of his more notable sermons sets forth his superb powers in their full strength. There is not a family in the church, or out of it, to which these sermons will not bring some sweet message of comfort and strength; nor is there a minister who will not be profited by a study of the secret by which this gifted minister drew to his ministry such large audiences from every calling in life.

12mo. Cloth, 75 cents net

Joyful Anthems for the Church Choir

Compiled by CHARLES H. GABRIEL

"This is a collection of fifty or more noble anthems, the words of which are, for the most part, either our choice hymns like 'Abide with me' and 'In the cross of Christ I glory' or majestic Psalms. The music is of a high order."—*Michigan Advocate*.

Single copy, \$1, postpaid. Per dozen, \$9, not prepaid

EATON & MAINS, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York
JENNINGS & GRAHAM, Cincinnati, O.

METHODIST REVIEW

MAY, 1905

ART. I.—IS JOSEPH FOREVER LOST TO US AS A REAL HISTORIC PERSON ?

THE history of the Hebrew people, which in our time is treated disparagingly by so many, is nevertheless, even from a psychological point of view, rich in content and sublime in character. How profound, for example, is the knowledge of the soul-life suggested by the words of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" How suggestive, again, the remark concerning Abraham and Isaac, "they went both of them together"—that is, in silence (Gen. 22. 8); the heart of each was burdened and the flow of speech obstructed. But a veritable treasure-house of fine psychological traits opens up to us in the story of Joseph and his dealings with his brethren. Who of us has not, with them, felt the sting of conscious guilt, and who, grateful for God's merciful directing of events, has not rejoiced with them? But, alas! in our day our psychological and ethical enjoyment of this narrative is destroyed. Here, as in the case of other portions of our precious Bible, the exclamation, "O how comforting, how instructive, and how beautiful this is!" is stifled by the anxious query, "But is it true?" For some are apparently intent upon enacting anew, and even more tragically, the scene of the selling of Joseph. When Joseph was sold into slavery by the majority of his brethren the separation which took place was followed by a reunion than which none more touching could be conceived, and the father who believed that he should sink into the grave mourning the loss of his beloved son was permitted once more to embrace his long-absent child.

But in our day Joseph is again cruelly torn from the heart of his father. Must Jacob now forever lament, "An evil beast hath devoured him"?

I. Joseph No Mythological Character.—We discover one attack on the historicity of this narrative in the attempt of many to identify the story of Joseph and his brethren with the myth of Tammuz or that of Adonis. According to these persons, the Israelites in their thought identified Joseph with the god of spring vegetation, who, in the mythology of the Babylonians and Phœnicians, having been killed by the intense heat of summer was with each new springtime revived. The principal defenders of this theory in recent times have been Professor H. Winckler and Alfred Jeremias. The former of these, in his *Geschichte Israels* (vol. ii, 1900, p. 62, f.), says: "Each time one of the moon-sons, (that is, sons of Jacob) comes to the sun-god (Joseph) he is made prisoner, Joseph thus each time retaining another of the number until the last and youngest is taken, when the scene ends." And, indeed, the scene would end here had the story of Joseph been written according to the mythological recipe of H. Winckler. In the theory of Alfred Jeremias the same hypothesis is linked with the words of Joseph, "I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews" (Gen. 40. 15). This sentence, according to Jeremias, is suggested to the narrator as he thinks of the Babylonian god Nebo, who was sometimes conceived as the god of thieves. The far more simple and natural explanation of these words of Joseph is that in the presence of strangers (comp. Gen. 40. 7) he sought in this way to shield his brethren and hide their wrong. This surely is simpler than to imagine that the narrator, being a Hebrew, should be thus intimately conversant with Babylonian mythology and be thinking of Nebo, the "god of thieves." For if any one thing be certain it is that the authors of the narratives of the Old Testament were professors of the religion of Jahweh. Hence the commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," was to them sacred, and they are to be defended against even the suspicion that they would associate with strange gods persons conspicuous in the traditions of their people. Is Jeroboam, who fled to Egypt and later returned, also but a more clumsy

representation (*Gestalt*) of the god Tammuz? On the contrary, this Babylonian god is not mentioned until in the later portion of the Old Testament, which again is entirely in harmony with the historical sequence of facts. Not until the beginning of Babylonian supremacy over Israel, and then only as a lamentable abomination and estrangement from Jahweh, does Ezekiel (8. 14, 15) mention the worship of Tammuz in Israel. What injustice, therefore, to imagine that the writer of the story of Joseph identifies his hero with this deity of the Babylonians!

II. Joseph Not a Product of Personification.—The principal heresy concerning Joseph at present is the so-called "hypothesis of personification." According to this theory the sons of Jacob are only individualized aggregations of the tribes of Israel, the existence of tribes being admitted but that of individual tribal ancestors being denied. Although the trees themselves must needs be left undisturbed, because of their obvious reality in history, the roots are destroyed. The passion for correcting records transmitted from ancient times must find an outlet somewhere, and this work of destroying roots, proceeding, as it does, under the surface, offers an especially inviting occupation. But scientific research must uncover secret operations such as these also, and love for the fascinating narrative of patriarchal times renders more effective the scientific research in this process of testing. That it is impossible, for example, to explain the portrait of Reuben, sketched for us in the first book of the Old Testament canon, by means of this new theory I have already shown in my pamphlet, *Neueste Principien der alttestamentlichen Kritik* (1902, p. 36, ff.). I desire now to direct the attention of the reader to the difficulties arising when the attempt is made to determine what the book of Genesis really does tell us concerning Joseph by an appeal to what is called "*das echt geschichtliche Verstandniss*" (literally, "the correct historical understanding"). Would it indeed be possible to prove even so much as the existence of such a person as Joseph from the later history of Israel alone? This later history, it is true, mentions Ephraim and Manasseh as among the tribes of Israel, making with Levi a total of thirteen tribes, but the facts of later history know nothing of a single tribe

of Joseph. The expression "the tribe of Joseph" occurs, in Num. 13. 11, only as introductory to the mention of the tribe of Manasseh, and similarly in Num. 36. 5. The tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh constitute "the children of Joseph" (Num. 1. 10) or "the house of Joseph" (Josh. 17. 17). How would it have been possible to arrive at a common ancestor in the case of these two tribes if in reality no such ancestor had existed?

The tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, moreover, as their later history attests, were not so absolutely united as to warrant the supposition that the intimacy of this union led to the inference of a common ancestry. In point of fact, the two tribes were at times opposed to each other. Thus Gideon, a native of west Manasseh (Judg. 6. 11, 15), performed his heroic task without the aid of Ephraim (Judg. 8. 1, f.), and Jephthah, very likely a native of east Manasseh (Judg. 11. 1), cast to the earth the pride of Ephraim (Judg. 12. 1, ff.). But is not the trend of historical events common to these two tribes the key to the understanding of the vicissitudes through which, according to the account in Genesis, Joseph passed? The answer to this question can only be, No! For in that event it would, first of all, be impossible to explain the part played by Reuben in the history of Joseph; since at no time in the history of Israel was the tribe of Reuben distinguished for any special protection rendered to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. What we learn from Gen. 37. 22, 29, ff., concerning Reuben's desire to save his brother from death and to deliver him to his father again, cannot, therefore, have been suggested by actual events of later history. Again, if the events of later history had furnished the coloring for the life portrait of Joseph, then Judah would of necessity appear as the principal enemy of Joseph in that portrait, for the almost constant rivalry existing between the tribes of Ephraim and Judah is well known. It was the tribe of Ephraim which after Saul's death stood at the head of the federation of tribes that refused allegiance to David because David was of the tribe of Judah. More than seven years David was compelled to sue for the friendship of the northern tribes, and at a later time only a very little spark was required to kindle anew the flame of enmity between Ephraim and Judah. The well known cry of the secession, "We

have no part in David, neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: every man to his tents, O Israel" (2 Sam. 20. 1 and 1 Kings 12. 16), calls this fact vividly to mind. In the life portrait of Joseph, on the contrary, we find Judah protecting the life of his brother and strongly emphasizing their kinship in the words, "He is our brother and our flesh" (Gen. 37. 27). It is Judah whom Jacob on entering Egypt sent "before him unto Joseph" (Gen. 46. 28), as if Judah were on friendlier terms with his brother than were the other sons. It was in the old tribal capital of Ephraim that the division of the kingdom took place which later proved the open sore on the life of the body politic of Israel. But the story of Joseph tells us of a reunion between himself and his brethren, and of his peaceful death among his brethren.

From this it is plain that the biography of Joseph in no sense mirrors the history of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. In respect, therefore, to the life portrait of Joseph the theory of personification fails to accomplish its purpose. But other considerations, starting from an entirely different point of view, weigh heavily against this derivation of the story of Joseph.

III. Joseph Not a Product of Self-Belittlement by the People of Israel.—Would it be at all probable that a nation should invent and perpetuate in the annals of its own national history an act such as that of the selling of Joseph by his brethren? Can the people of Israel have been so foolish as to add to their history a fictitious account of a period of national slavery such as that of Egypt? Why should it seem improbable that the story of Joseph should have been faithfully transmitted in all its essential points during the period of from four to eleven generations?—which according to my estimate must have elapsed between the time of Jacob's sons and that of Moses and his contemporaries. Thus one might continue asking questions indefinitely. It was nothing unnatural for a Hebrew to win a place of prominence under the Hyksos, themselves not a native Egyptian race, but foreigners. The Egyptian monuments, moreover, testify to the fact that the Nile valley was more than once overrun by desert tribes from the East. Nor has the assertion that the name "Misraim" (Egypt) in Hebrew writings should be rather "Musran"

(in northern Arabia) received the indorsement of scholars. In my recent pamphlet, *Fuenf neue arabische Landschaftsnamen im Alten Testament*, this hypothesis was shown to be without foundation. Its conclusions have been more recently indorsed by P. Jensen in the *Theologischen Literaturzeitung* (issue of February 20, 1904). The attempt has been vain of those who have charged the historical consciousness of the Egyptians with having confused an eastern with a western province, of arbitrarily determining upon the city of Rameses (Exod. 12. 37) as the starting point of the exodus, and of recording the story of the kine on the banks of the Nile and other details of the narrative—which Egyptologists acknowledge to be truly Egyptian—without any historical background whatever. Was the northwestern portion of Arabia the granary of the ancient world, or was it the Nile valley to which in times of famine the nations turned for relief? Ancient Hebrew literature (Gen. 12. 10; 26. 2; 42. 1; Isa. 23. 3) answers, "It was the Nile valley," thus agreeing with Herodotus (2. 13, f.) and other writers, and their united testimony is no doubt correct.

IV. Joseph a Real Person, Modern Theories to the Contrary Notwithstanding.—So thou, noble form of Joseph, art not to be cast into the shadowy realm of mythology, nor yet to the outer darkness of nonexistence. We may still continue to repeat thy story without at the same time thinking of the Babylonian god Tammuz. We may still admire thy patience in suffering and thy steadfastness in temptation, since these are still the achievements of a true human person. Thy indignant outcry, "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?" may still steel the hearts of men in their conflict with the allurements of the flesh and the world. Thy humble confession, "Am I in the place of God?" may still tame the presumptuous pride of mortals. Thy significant words concerning the mysterious progress and sequence of events, "Ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good," may therefore, in the future as in the past, be regarded by us as a source of illumination which thou hast opened.

Ed. König,

ART. II.—THE AVERAGE SERMON

THE average sermon is not regarded with much favor nor received with special appreciation. The pews, realizing that they have been misbehaving during the week, giving too much heed to the things of the world—money-making, pleasure-seeking, body-pampering, with all that these involve—expect severe rebuke for their varied sins and numerous transgressions. Hence they set themselves in array, grimly facing the pulpit with heroic resolve, thoroughly conscious that they deserve punishment but hopeful of their ability to take it gracefully. The other parts of the service are tacitly understood to be mere preliminaries leading up to the distinctive feature of the hour, adjuncts to make it more telling and effective. In the hymns, therefore, the pews often read between the lines and not infrequently have a hint of what is coming. Sometimes this nerves them, gives them a momentary courage, inspires them to splendid endurance; or it may depress them, lead them into the valley of penitence, and thus enable the sermon to more effectually accomplish its purpose. This may explain why the pews seldom sing. In many cases they are afraid to sing, lest by so doing they give the sermon an advantage to which it is not entitled. Then the prayers nearly always are a sort of verbal John Baptist, a devotional messenger, a spiritual herald preparing the way for that which is to come. This the pews understand. Experience, painful too, has taught them that the average pulpit prayer is a sort of sermonette, or, as Archbishop Whately termed it, "Oblique preaching." This may account for the members who are late in coming to church, who prefer to stand in the vestibule rather than sit in the pews; for many have the impression that the opening prayer is not of much consequence, as it is certain of fuller development in the sermon.

But, while conceding the pulpit's right to rebuke with all authority, the pews insist that their punishment shall not go beyond the given limit; hence a prescribed time is set for the sermon, though occasionally, if the circumstances be very unusual, this time may be lengthened by a few minutes. In view of the fact that the

Roman Catholic Church puts such stress on penance—giving the works of the body for the sins of the soul—it may not seem advisable to thus classify the sermon; nevertheless the idea in some way suggests itself. Of course this refers only to the average sermon, the sermon preached by the average preacher, not to the sermon on Conference or camp-meeting Sunday, when the bishop, with an eloquence as rare as it is overwhelming, carries his audience to heights supernal, and so fills them, thrills them, arouses them to such a pitch of enthusiasm that the memory of that hour remains like a burning bush in the wilderness, a place from which God spoke out of the flame. The writer has a vivid remembrance of several such sermons, and not only are they recalled at times with great pleasure but they serve as examples and inspirations; for what man has done man can do again, and the greatest achievements of bygone years, whether in the pulpit or out of it, should be but incitements to yet greater things. But in these special cases peculiar and impressive circumstances affected both the preacher and the congregation. The sermon, therefore, was not an average one. Hence it was listened to with distinct favor, and the pews did not present that weary, strained expression so often seen in the average church. For who has not observed the grateful sigh with which the announcement of “lastly” is received; the sense of disappointment when “finally” seems as an opening into further discourse; the ill concealed impatience when “furthermore” promises to outrun the clock; the smile of pitiful resignation at the familiar, “just a word in conclusion;” and the manifest relief when the sermon has reached its end? These things are very evident in the average congregation where the average sermon is preached, and no one, except possibly the preacher who is deficient in visual capacity or whose self-complacency has attained splendid proportions, can fail to observe them. And they imply, if such things can imply anything, that the average sermon is dull, spiritless, of no special value or interest, and is only endured because of traditions that reach back into the dim unknown. Perhaps this is one reason why the average man is not a churchgoer—he is afraid of the average sermon. When he thinks of sitting cooped up in a pew listening for three quarters of an hour, often longer, to com-

monplace things said in a commonplace way, there grows upon him the feeling that in such a case "absence of body is better than presence of mind"; though often, oftener perhaps than the preachers imagine, a man's bodily presence in church does not necessarily involve his presence of mind. But for some reason—let those who will stop here and argue it out—the average man has a positive dread of the average sermon and avoids it whenever he can. Any excuse, no matter how trivial, will be brought into service. Things which would not detain him from the office, the store, the shop, serve their purpose on Sunday, and ailments, however distressing in the early forenoon, disappear most strangely when the church bells cease. And, still more strange, the churches that have no sermon at all have the largest congregations. Cantatas, praise services, sacred concerts, in all of which the preacher has a very subordinate part, hardly even master of ceremonies, usually attract multitudes of people, while at the regular preaching services in the same church the pews will be dismally empty. It is true that there are those who affirm that people are hungry for "gospel sermons" and if the preacher will only preach "the gospel, the whole gospel, and nothing but the gospel" the church will be thronged with hearers. Then there must have been a reversal of human nature since the days of the prophets and apostles, for then it was declared that the people would not hear the word of the Lord, and that the carnal mind was enmity against God. And unless our eyes are strangely holden we can surely see that the people are not clamorous for these supposedly gospel sermons. No crowds are surging about the church waiting eagerly for admittance. The contrast between the throngs at the average church door and the entrance of some place of popular amusement is significant. We may say that these are the thoughtless, irreligious masses, who, prodigal with their money, reckless with their time, and indifferent to the serious concerns of life, thus waste themselves. But these are the very people who should be coming to our churches, filling our pews, entering earnestly upon Christian work, and hastening the coming of the kingdom of God. The sooner we get rid of this hunger-for-the-gospel notion the better. Far wiser is the preacher who understands that he is dealing with a world that lieth in wickedness,

the same world that crucified his Master, and which everyday renews that crucifixion and puts him to an open shame. The man who is content to preach a simpering sillabub—which by a wild stretch of imagination is sometimes called a gospel sermon, because it is largely made up of texts that seem to fit into each other and interspersed with jingling hymns—has assuredly a strange way of attacking the strongholds of sin and breaking down the refuge of lies in which so many have intrenched themselves. The preacher who calmly says, "It is not my business to fill the church or attract people to the sanctuary. My business is simply to declare the whole counsel of God," has not most certainly worked out that parable of Jesus in which he says, "Compel them to come in, that my house may be filled." But the average sermon will not compel them to come in; it is much more likely to compel them to stay out.

1. The average sermon is too long. One of the greatest preachers in Methodism, an orator of surpassing power, whose sentences are marvels of word building and whose thought is always high and stimulating, stated not long since that he rarely allowed himself half an hour for a sermon, oftener less than more. Here, now, is a question in proportion: If a splendidly equipped, highly educated, and wonderfully gifted preacher is content with thirty minutes for pulpit discourse, how much time should be given to the average preacher for the average sermon? To hold the mind steadily to any one line of thought for thirty minutes is no light task. The preacher may imagine, because the congregation is comparatively quiet, that he is having undivided attention. But he is mistaken. The faces of the people may be turned toward the pulpit and their eyes follow the preacher's movements, but how wayward are their thoughts! Like birds chasing each other through an ivy-covered ruin, one moment in the shadows and another moment in the light, now swinging in circles through the sky and again swooping down close to the earth, so have the thoughts of the people wandered as they sat in the pews. The parable of the sower is as true to-day as when it fell from the lips of Jesus. Fortunate indeed is that preacher who can gain for his message the same proportion of results as the parable suggests.

It is true that Saint Paul once preached a very long sermon, continuing his speech until midnight—with serious consequences, however; for a young man fell, while in a deep sleep, from the third loft, and only by a miracle escaped from death. This proves unquestionably that even apostles, though possessing the gifts of Saint Paul, may through lengthened discourse cause much weariness to the flesh. Some sermons seem as a train without brakes. They go and go, and keep going, rushing past stations where many would like to get off, and only stop when the fires give out and the steam fails in the boiler. Such sermons usually stop in some tunnel or in a region unknown, leaving the passengers helpless and bewildered. Many a preacher, by mistaking the signals, loses a splendid chance to stop. Why can't we do with sermons as we do with powder—pack them, compress them, get them within small compass, and thus make them infinitely more effective? A short parable that of Nathan's—very. But how terrific! Like a shell bursting against battlements of stone, so it fell upon the ears of the guilty king. Loose steam, however plentiful, is valueless. Not until it is forced within the limits of a cylinder has it any definite energy. But once there it has the strength of a giant. A distinguished writer once essayed to put his thoughts into words, while the train was speeding through a tunnel. Four minutes were spent in the journey, but his thinkings, which the author afterward printed, filled several pages of a magazine. The average sermon has no right to draw itself out after the fashion of an endless chain. People who are busy all the week with things that tax them to the utmost should not be compelled, through tradition, or custom, or because of instinctive respect for the pulpit, to sit helpless for three quarters of an hour while the average sermon is dinged into their unwilling ears. Why should the preacher try to exhaust every theme he discusses? Better leave something for next Sunday and the Sunday after. That is one of the great charms of the Bible. It never exhausts anything. It takes up subjects, even men and women, and for a moment holds them in the light, and, like great waves caught by the sun, they sparkle and gleam with divine radiance, but drop back to make way for the transfiguration of others. But in the average sermon the flail threshes every-

thing out, even to the last straw. Hence parents are afraid to bring their children to church, for the long service wearies them and they become restless and are a source of trouble not only to those immediately concerned, but others as well. Hence many of our young people do not enjoy coming to church, for, though they like the singing and the service generally, the sermon is distressingly tedious. And hence grown-up people make excuses to stay away from church, availing themselves of every imaginable pretext, but really to avoid the sermon. In short, to put in a few words the general sentiment, the average sermon is too long and the average preacher is tiresome! Of course the average sermon will resent this, and will flutter like a startled bird in its manilla envelope, or raise its indignant voice from the depths of the preacher's barrel, but neither resentment nor indignation has any bearing on the sad facts in the case.

2. The average sermon is too short. Not, however, as regards time, but something far more important—reach. With a Bible at his hand from which to draw studies in character, incidents in history, snatches of poetry, gleams of prophecy, a Bible in which the most thrilling and dramatic events are related with amazing power, and which, from beginning to end, is a series of splendid miracles and parables, one might naturally expect that the preacher would feel the spell of the mysterious atmosphere in which his soul may live and move and have its being. Think of the sky that arches over the Scriptures! The most marvelous creations of romance are dull, commonplace things—poor, pasty imitations of the diamond in which are hidden a myriad fires—when compared with the wonders of God's Holy Word. Visions infinitely more transcendent than ever flashed on poet's mind—whether that poet be a Milton reveling in the glories of a *Paradise Regained*, a Dante traversing the mysteries of *The Inferno*, or a Browning in whose genius we have a bridal of the earth and sky—are in the pages under the preacher's eye and subject to his will. Why, then, with all this wealth of material, this outpouring of the Divine Mind, this flooding of earth with the wonders of heaven, is the average sermon such a tame, commonplace thing? Has the preacher no imagination, no poetic genius, no flashing of mysterious light, no

spiritual quality by which he can avail himself of the marvelous material at his hand? Instead of being an eagle, able to rise into divine and supernatural skies and hold converse with ministers of fire, is he simply a barnyard fowl, content with a handful of corn and a place to roost? Then his place is not in the ministry. He may be a pastor of surprising fidelity and have an intimate acquaintance with every home in his parish, he may be favored with much executive ability and have his church organized in every department, he may take high rank as a financier and under his leadership new churches be erected or pressing obligations be removed—but these things are matters of ordinary business. They do not imply or require a divine call. They are all easily within the scope of any capable, intelligent man. There is nothing in such work that could not be done, oftener much better, by a book agent, a general business man, or an insurance canvasser. And it is largely because the church has expected these things of the preacher, and he has been weak enough to yield to this demand, that the average sermon is such a barren, spiritless thing. If the preacher is so favored with various gifts that in addition to his own special work he can discharge all manner of parish duties without impairing the vigor or versatility of his preaching, the church gains just so much more. But his chief ministry must be in the pulpit. To that work he was divinely called, and for that work he was set apart. For him, therefore, to fritter himself away in trivial, and in many cases needless, concerns is a mistake so serious as to approach the gravity of a crime. And when a sermon lacks fiber, quality, scope, vision, the failure of the preacher is absolute, no matter how well he may have succeeded in other things. Great pulpits invariably make great pews. Big, strong, vigorous sermons are certain in time to develop hearers of the same character. The order of creation obtains here as everywhere else—like produces like, everything after its kind. Take the churches that lead in all forms of Christian work, whose offerings are expressions of splendid generosity and whose examples are of priceless value, and in every instance it will be found that the average sermon was not preached in their pulpits. Far from it. In such pulpits the sermons were not made of shoe leather and cyclopedic

illustrations. Like the painter's colors, they were mixed with brains. It was beaten oil that the preacher brought to the sanctuary. The sermon therefore had reach, scope, breadth of view, massive thinking, and out of it, as a tree out of its roots, there grew up a congregation of the same class and power. The reason there are so many average Christians in our churches is because they have only average sermons. Hence they are not mighty in faith, daring to the point of heroism, splendidly generous, absolute in their consecration, and eager for any service to which they are called. They know nothing of enthusiasm which burns with intense heat, of a religion that is simply a consuming passion, or of a love for Christ and his church that has neither limit nor restrictions. And how could they? The average sermon to which they listened every Sunday had nothing in it that would inspire them to any such life. Instead of being a Jacob's ladder reaching from earth to heaven, with angels on every rung and God at the top, it was simply a bit of flooring, made out of common boards, with supports barely sufficient to lift it from the ground. A real sermon ought to be a spiritual derrick, with chain of ample length to reach into the deep quarries of care, sorrow, anxiety, sin, temptation, worldliness, in which so many have been living during the week, and by sheer force raise them from the gloom and darkness and swing them into the light of hope which God intends for his children. This means work—brain work, heart work, soul work. For such a derrick is not built in an hour. Nor can it be borrowed from a sermon cyclopedia. Machines of this type require time, thought, care, labor, days of anxiety, nights of prayer, a strain of intense and exhausting degree. But anything less means the average sermon, a mere aggregation of words, a monotonous rumble of commonplace phrase, a soporific arrangement of thoughtless sound, a thing without reach, grip, force, intensity, or power, from which the multitudes turn away and allow the churches to enjoy their own emptiness and desolation. The sermon which does not come to the people as the chariot came for Elijah—a blazing, burning messenger from the skies—with such power as will lift them from the earth, and for the time translate them into the heavens of God, is little better than an ordinary

stagecoach, a heavy lumbering thing in which the hapless passengers are dragged wearily along. Of the stagecoach the average man has a wholesome dread, just as he has of the average sermon. So his pew in church is vacant, and the pulpit calls to him in vain.

3. The average sermon is too high. This does not refer to thought, for under certain conditions the higher a man's thinking the better for both the church and the world. Horizontal sermons, discourses that rest on the ground, mosaics made up of newspaper clippings and topics of the day, may for a time crowd the pews, but the pews even then are emptier than before! There is nothing easier than to fill a church with a gaping, curious crowd. The preacher has but to forget the solemn responsibility which attaches to his high office, the divine message with which he is intrusted, the destiny of the souls who look to him for guidance, and the infinite cost of the world's redemption, and give himself up to cheap, paltry efforts at so-called reform, frantically attack certain phases of public life, use the newspaper with unsparing hand, talk extravagantly, gesticulate wildly, rant vehemently, and ere long an eager, applauding crowd will be in attendance. But what is gained by all this? Nothing whatever. And much is lost, and worse than lost; for in the end the church suffers so seriously and the preacher's influence is impaired so deeply that recovery is almost impossible. For this some would blame the church officials, because they demand, at whatever hazard, crowd-compelling sermons, but it is the preacher who is at fault. He is under no obligation to accept his topics from a board of trustees. Nor will any right-minded board put such a burden on him. On the contrary, they will honor him all the more for his fidelity to the commission given him from heaven. But because he sees, through a sort of scare-head preaching, an easy way to fill his church he becomes a yellow pulpiteer, and by means of a catch-penny sermon attracts a catch-penny congregation. In such sermons there is, of course, no high thinking. Indeed, there is hardly any kind of thinking. The discourse, if it can be so dignified, is merely a series of hot air blasts, and the effect is as transient as it is useless. Considering that the preacher's only business is to grapple with the souls of men, to redeem them from the body of worldliness and sin

in which they are imprisoned, to translate them from the kingdom of darkness to the kingdom of light, it is surprising that he ever allows topics of trivial moment to claim discourse. Jesus made no attempt at reforming Jerusalem. Paul conducted no campaign against political corruption in Rome. While Savonarola held aloof from politics, and preached the gospel with overwhelming power, he was the mightiest force in Florence. The men whose ministry has been signally owned of God—Luther quickening all Germany, Wesley arousing Great Britain from spiritual torpor, Edwards kindling revival fires throughout New England—held themselves steadily to the cardinal truths of God's Word. And because of this their work is imperishable. But the average sermon, though far from being high in its thinking, is abnormally high in its standard of requirements, and in the spirit of phariseeism makes demands for which there is no warrant. And this men resent. For it savors of popery; it interferes with the individual conscience. This is an invasion of territory which if not resisted, would involve a loss of independence. The average preacher, when discussing a theme regarding which there may be honest divergence of opinion, rarely allows himself to use the language of Saint Paul and say, "But I speak this by permission, and not by commandment." With him it is a commandment. He is a Mount Sinai in himself. The question is settled. The case is decided. No appeal is possible. His interpretation is absolute. So for the time the preacher becomes a priest; he speaks *ex cathedra*, and the Maranatha is ready at his hand to be hurled at the one who doubts his authority. Men of undoubted integrity may differ from the preacher who so dogmatically asserts himself, and their opinions are often known and shared by the pews, but the average sermon makes short work of all such heresies. Against this the pews vigorously protest, with sometimes disastrous results. Why have we so much discussion in the church concerning matters which are in nowise essential? Why have we angry and clamorous debate regarding things which, in the sight of God, every man must settle for himself? Why should the average sermon assume for itself a divine inspiration, when that inspiration leads to statements out of harmony with the genius of the gospel? When Noah built the

ark he put the door on the side near the ground, so that even creeping things might easily find entrance, but the average ark builder of this day puts the door on the top story and insists that weary sinners climb up a steep stairway of agreements and covenants before they can enter upon the Christian life. In Saint Paul's time these stairway constructors threatened to seriously disturb the church, and we find the apostle referring to them as, "Certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment." On matters that were of supreme importance, such as genuine repentance for sin, faith in Christ as a Saviour, the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit, adoption into the family of God, a frank avowal of discipleship at whatever hazard, a life of steadfast adherence to the gospel—regarding all these, and others of similar import, Saint Paul declared himself with a finality which admitted of no question; but never once did he intrude upon the domain of personal rights or cross the barrier of the individual conscience. But the average sermon sets up a standard to which all must conform, more rigid than that of an officer recruiting for the army. For in his case a certain latitude is allowed; every man need not be of the same height, nor the same weight, nor of the same general proportions. But with the average sermon every man must believe so much, profess so much, promise so much, and deny so much. In this sense the average sermon is too high, higher than there is any authority for in the Scriptures, higher far than is consonant with the spirit of the gospel. These impossible, unattainable, altitudinous ideals may perhaps have some value in the general scheme of Christian development, but where in them do we find the suggestion of a gospel net which when cast into the sea gathers of every kind? The sermon for this day, for every day since Jesus gave us his gospel, and for every day in the life of our poor sin-cursed world, is that of the great sheet in Peter's vision on the house top. Anything narrow or intolerant is unworthy of Him who wrote "Whosoever" in blood, who spoke pardon to a guilty penitent at his side, and whose dying breath was spent in praying for forgiveness for those who had nailed him to the accursed tree. What a

sermon that was which he wrote with his finger on the ground! What a sermon that was in the house of Simon when the tears of a despairing woman fell on his feet! And that is the preaching the world needs now. But such preaching is not in the average sermon. For it lacks pity, tenderness, sympathy; it makes no appeal to the awful sorrow and sin with which so many hearts are burdened; it is not a voice of divine compassion, but rather that of a trumpet from the fire-clad Sinai. And so it fails to inspire and comfort. Therefore the ears of the world are deadened against the sound.

4. The average sermon is too low. And this in several particulars. Take, for instance, its appeal. How little incitement to splendid living, to superb self-mastery, to the development and enrichment of character, to the working out of the loftiest ideals! Consider Saint Paul's marvelous words: "Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things;" then compare such an appeal with that of the average sermon. The apostle was pleading for a splendid manhood, for an incarnation of the noblest virtues pertaining to the gospel, for a positive embodiment of the same principles that actuated the mind of Christ. Or recall that wondrous chapter in the Epistle to the Corinthians in which charity is dwelt upon with surpassing genius, and contrast it with the attainments suggested by the average sermon. From first to last, in every epistle, Saint Paul's appeal is based on the highest possible motives, never once suggesting anything ulterior or selfish. Small wonder, then, that the men trained in such teaching, and living under the inspiration of such ideals, gave little heed to the threats of Nero or the horrors of the amphitheater. And the only way that the sublime heroism of the early church can be accounted for is by remembering that "stature in Christ Jesus" was considered the supreme spiritual attainment. Under such teaching heroism was easy. Superb manhood and glorious martyrdom spring from the same root. When men are filled with the desire to be Christlike, and everything is subordinated to that desire, the cross has no terrors and the grave is but the doorway to a glorious resurrection. But in the average sermon there is no such appeal. The preacher talks in a

vague way about "being born again," "passing from death to life," but he rarely shows that religion means an actual transformation, an utter abandonment of the common, groveling things of the flesh, and the entering upon such a phase of being as will mean substantially a new creation. The appeal of the average sermon is largely prudential; the motive addressed is of the commercial class, and godliness is represented as a matter of personal gain. The dividend idea is made more or less prominent. The suggestion of a bargain often appears. In various forms the thought of an investment is presented, and even the most earnest entreaty carries with it the possibility of a contract. The result is a general haggling as to the cost of religion. So much pew rent for so much gospel, with the possibilities of heaven thrown in as a clincher to the sale. Is it any wonder that rich men hold back and allow hospitals to remain unfinished, schools to remain unfounded, churches to remain unbuilt, the poor to remain unfed? Is it any wonder that men dicker and chaffer about prices and terms before they will enter the church, asking if this pleasure must be abandoned and the other amusement be given up? This whole idea is nothing more or less than the Romish plan of indulgences, only presented in another form. The appeal of the average sermon, therefore, makes no demand on the higher nature. It is sordid, mercenary, and at times dangerously avaricious. The preacher who makes a bargain counter of his pulpit, and offers the gospel at a mark down from cost, cannot surely know the meaning of Calvary or understand Him who said, "If any man will be my disciple let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." "And he that taketh not the cross and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." The average sermon by its low appeal has made possible many of the conditions that now distress and embarrass the church. For men have come to think that religion need have no definite application to their daily life, that no special demand is made other than an outward conformity to certain rules and rubrics, and that the kingdom of God relates to some mysterious realm beyond the skies to which their church membership guarantees them an abundant entrance. Hence they live very much as other men. They are in the world. They are harsh, ungenerous,

fickle, unloving. Some of them are more concerned about treasures on earth than they are about treasures in heaven. Many of them have ample time for business or pleasure, but little time for the house or service of God. But the fault is not all theirs. They have not been properly trained. The motive appealed to in their case was too low. And a motive, like the fly wheel of an engine, must always be large enough and heavy enough to conserve the engine's power, else there will be no steadiness in the stroke and the energy fritter away. The only motive that should ever be presented in the pulpit is the possibility of attaining "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

Real preaching is sadly needed in these days, never more so in the history of the church; preaching that will be fearless yet tender, sturdy yet gracious, searching yet inspiring, sincere yet generous, divine yet human. No man has such a splendid mission as the preacher; no place has such possibilities within its reach as the pulpit. The man who can say, "Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth," and with the unction of the Holy One deliver the message with which he has been intrusted, is capable of rendering a wondrous service to the world. But the man who is content to preach the average sermon fails miserably to appreciate the high vocation to which he has been called.

J. Wesley Johnston

ART. III.—THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN THE SCIENCE OF THEOLOGY

THERE is a bewildering confusion of thought touching the seat of authority in religion; a mischievous failure to distinguish the grounds of theological science from the practical reasons for moral and religious conduct. For example, we are told that the conscience of the individual is the seat of authority in religion. Now, this may mean either that each conscience is a competent judge and final authority in every realm of theological science—a proposition that needs to be stated only to insure its rejection—or that his conscience must determine in every case where action is necessary what authority the individual will follow—a proposition that no one denies, Roman Catholic and agnostic alike agreeing that the choice of a guide in religion and morality devolves in the last resort upon the individual.

It will illuminate the matter to consider where lies the seat of authority in science generally or in any one of the sciences. It is absurd to say that it lies in the vulgar mind or the vulgar conscience; it is equally absurd to say that it lies in the consensus of all those who attempt the study of science in general or of some particular science, for among these are a multitude of incompetents; it is absurd to say that it lies in some elected investigator—self-chosen or otherwise—or in some selected company of sages, like the Royal Society of England or the Academy of Science in France. It lies confessedly outside of all these in a standard to which they all, directly or indirectly, appeal. The vulgar mind—to begin with it—is in many instances incompetent to determine the actual phenomena of perception; it misinterprets the data of sense and feeling; it sees ghosts that do not exist; it hears voices that do not speak; it miscalculates distances and confuses objects; it fails to discriminate imaginations from recollections and inferences from perceptions. To set up this vulgar mind as the ultimate authority in any science is obviously absurd. Then, again, the vulgar mind knows little or nothing directly of that external standard of right reason to which the instructed mind appeals, and it is ignorant of

the methods to be employed. The vulgar mind either stubbornly defends the accuracy of its assertions, suffers itself to be enlightened, or yields to some immediate authority. It accepts, for instance, the rotundity and rotation of the earth because the text-book or the teacher asserts them, or it obstinately insists that the earth is flat and that the sun is moving in the circle of the sky. It accepts scientific statements because of those who declare them or because of the power and advantage derived from their use. It understands neither the methods of their discovery nor the proofs of their validity. To do either it must cease to be vulgar and become enlightened or scientific. It cannot become an authority of any value even to itself by mere intrusion into some department of science, whether it be physics or theology. It must be an instructed mind before it has the right even to speak there. Is, then, the instructed mind an ultimate authority in science? By no means. For it is quite possible for the instructed mind to overlook a fact or to be ignorant of its discovery; yet such a fact when pointed out by a less-instructed and inferior intellect may compel the modification or even the abandonment of a proposition held by the superior and enlightened intellect. Facts are authoritative instantly they are perceived. It is equally possible, moreover, that a defect of reasoning may be detected in the processes by which a powerful and enlightened mind has reached certain conclusions. This has happened frequently. Logic is authoritative to all that keep her commandments.

It looks as if we were running into a blind alley; as if we were about to deny the possibility of authority altogether. But we shall do nothing of the sort. Authorities are created by acts of the will. They may grow up unawares and continue by consent of the governed, or they may be chosen deliberately. We submit to existing authorities, to the state or the church in which we find ourselves, to the teacher, the sea captain, the physician chosen for us, or we choose them for ourselves. The authority that prevails in the sciences is precisely of this sort. One may indeed choose to make one's self the ultimate authority in science; and, as I shall show hereafter, the supreme intellect must. But the

wiser students will follow the footsteps of the giants; they will follow a Helmholtz or a Darwin, a Kelvin or a Wundt. The giants, however, defer to each other and to the authority of facts and of logic. They compare and scrutinize severely each other's work; they seek to discover the causes of disagreement in results, whether it be a difference of data or a difference of logical treatment; for the authority to which these giants defer finally is the authority of superior modes of perception and of superior modes of reasoning. Optics for the color-blind, acoustics for the music-deaf, would be poverty-stricken sciences compared with those worked out from normal and supernormal perceptions of sight and sound. And any sciences worked out by the logically defective would be a wonder of unreason.

I have used the adjective supernormal. Let me pause a moment to explain. We differ in our ability to perceive. The senses of sight and of hearing are in some men close to the miraculous and may be justly termed supernormal; we may apply the same term to those perceptions that we obtain by cunning instruments like the microscope and the ophthalmoscope.

Now, it is quite plain that a company of investigators endowed with supernormal powers of sense-perception, equipped with these cunning instruments of observation, and trained to accurate and comprehensive reasoning, would constitute a congress whose deliverances upon their chosen subjects of investigation would be entitled to attention and respect. And if we could gather a parliament that reasoned perfectly on every kind of subject we should have in science what the Roman Catholic Church claims to be in religion: an organ of authoritative knowledge. Unfortunately—or perhaps fortunately for the progress of mankind—there is no such general council, no such hierarchy of science. There are none wise enough and noble enough to compose it. An extraordinary document referring to Helmholtz, that I shall cite farther on, shows how few indeed are the encyclopedic minds; and Tyndall's pathetic description of Faraday's reluctance to surrender a cherished theory, with Sir David Brewster's irritation when his was criticised, shows how seldom even the colossal mind is free from bias. The scientific mind—or I should say the scien-

tific character—is composed of very rare and seemingly contradictory qualities. The truth must be perceived clearly and held firmly. It is not enough to discover it; it must be expounded, proved, defended. Unless the giant thinker is biased strongly in favor of a theory he will not urge it with unflagging patience and indomitable industry. He must reason with amazing celerity and accuracy and yet stand by his conclusions with unflinching obstinacy. He must be at once open to conviction and slow to be convinced. A General Council of the Sciences is therefore impossible even if it were desirable. Nevertheless, to the glory of modern science, we have smaller councils of trained and candid inquirers in more than one department—men to whom truth is imperative, command what sacrifice she may. And the approval of such a particular council comes as near to authority as we shall ever get in this world of blunder and error. The only appeal from it is to a similar council of the future. The scientist, despised and rejected by his contemporaries, may be justified by a later generation or even a remote posterity. Thus Darwin and Wallace appealed from the older to the younger biologists; they obtained first a hearing, then recognition, and finally enthronement for their hypothesis. Possibly not for all time, certainly not without concessions and amendments, but the substantial victory was with them. Mark, however, that the authority did *not* reside in Darwin or in Wallace; it resided in the court to which they appealed. And this court recognized in its turn the authority of the reason, common alike to the appellants and their judges? these all deferring to the authority of facts and the authority of right thinking. No proposition, however long established or however widely held, can escape comparison with new-found facts. Only the assertor of them must present them openly for scrutiny. The assertor of them is not and cannot be an ultimate authority either as to the reality or the significance of his impressions. He is not an authority even to himself. He is at best only the honest reporter of his impressions, his observations, his experiments; he is at best only the honest defender and expounder of his own conclusions. These he must submit for revision and correction, for acceptance or rejection, to a court of competent

inquiry; to his fellow investigators in the same field of research; and—in the final instance—to a competent posterity.

Consider, for example, the career of Helmholtz. Here was indeed a giant; one who has been pronounced, by a renowned contemporary, the greatest physicist of all time. But Helmholtz was a deferential giant; one who took infinite pains to obtain the necessary facts and to reach correct conclusions; one whose senses and whose intellect were supernormal and whose patience and industry likewise; one who studied not only to reach the truth, but who studied to state it clearly and to support it invincibly. Nevertheless, this giant deferred humbly to his competent fellow laborers, ready to revise his statements or to enlarge them at the suggestion of men like Du Bois Keymond or his own beloved pupil, Hertz. The following words express with Doric severity this love of "truth in the inward parts," which in him, as in Sir Isaac Newton, dwelt in a spirit at once sublime and humble: "As my conscience, so to speak, there stood by me in imagination the most competent of my friends. Would they approve it? I always asked myself. They hovered before me as the embodiment of the scientific spirit of an ideal humanity and gave me my standard." What, then, is the vaunted right of private judgment for the scientific thinker? It is simply the right to be honest and the duty to be competent; the right to arrive at the truth by thorough and conscientious research and to defend his findings before a competent tribunal; the right to challenge the judgment of an "outside conscience" and to propagate his conclusions by the severe methods of scientific exposition. And yet it may happen that the very superiority of an investigator like Helmholtz compels him sometimes to stand alone in support of a proposition, the proof that he offers for it seeming inadequate or unintelligible even to the most competent of his judges. "I am glad," wrote the eminent Kirchhoff, "when I can master anything that Helmholtz gives us, but there is much in his great work upon Tone Sensations that I cannot master." Here, then, we reach a proposition of vital significance. Only the supreme intellect can be an authority in science to itself and to others, and then but in a restricted sense. The inferior intellect must defer to the superior and the superior to

the supreme, and since none of these are infallible there must be a reference "to the scientific spirit of an ideal humanity." If it should happen, as in the case of Galileo, that one endowed with a supernormal measure of sense and reason is tempted to betray his trust he is false to himself and false also to this scientific spirit of an ideal humanity. He defers to an authority which has usurped the throne. The thing is not true because Galileo discovers it, but Galileo was ordained of God to discover it and to defend it at all hazards because it is true.

Unfortunately the terms "science" and "scientific method" are employed with discreditable laxity, and every dabbler in any of the sciences fancies that he has a moral right to utter judgments upon any topic, however difficult, to which he may turn "what he is pleased to call his mind." How loose the talk about social science, historical science, psychological science, and the like, and what prattle about the scientific method from admirers and detractors of it who have hardly a glimmer of its real character! Just now it looks as if a slaughter of the innocents were impending in the name of a new psychology, and an era of experiment with the family and the state in the name of sociology, and an overthrow of all erudition in the name of historical science. It is time to pause and ponder. It is time to deny the name science to fields of inquiry where the scientific method appears only in caricature. Above all, it is time to deny to every chatterer and scribbler the moral right to utter judgments upon grave problems for whose understanding he is ludicrously incompetent. "It exasperates me," wrote Helmholtz, "often as I have resolved not to be exasperated, that people who are unable to grasp the smallest propositions in geometry coolly, and in full confidence of their superior wisdom, deliver judgments upon the most difficult problems in the theory of space." This impudent incompetence which even the giants cannot expel from the frontiers of geometry flourishes unscathed in other fields of research; flourishes alike among conservatives and progressives; the ultra-conservative extolling his opinion as an utterance of God or a law of nature and the ultra-radical propounding his opinion as a mandate of an inspired conscience of the last word of science. The freak professor is the

latest progeny of this delusion. *Ex cathedra* opinions are not science. Correct conclusions drawn from verified experience—these alone are science, and few there be that find them.

Choosing a guide for practical purposes is quite another matter; this we must all do or have done for us. In the beginning it is done for us; later there comes the opportunity to do it for ourselves. We cannot choose the physician that assists at our birth; we may choose the physician who tries to rescue us from death. The reason for choosing one physician rather than another, with sensible people, is his reputation or his personality, either or both. The reputation may be unwarranted, the personality deceptive. Subtle and complex influences may enter unawares into the selection. It may prove an unhappy one; it does quite often. Nevertheless, only a conceited simpleton would attempt before engaging a physician to examine him in every branch of medical science. So in every case where we are compelled to choose a guide we either abide by the choice that others have made for us or choose because of reputation, or personal experience, or an impression derived from the man himself. "He was my father's guide when I was a boy; I have traveled with him myself and proved his ability; I like his speech and his appearance." So in science, whoever has achieved great results, whoever has discovered fruitful truths, acquires reputation. He may have been distrusted, assailed, contradicted; he may have suffered persecution and obloquy; if a man of extraordinary genius he has surely done so, for such a man is certain by his discoveries to disturb existing systems and to call in question cherished beliefs; he must inevitably meet severe criticism and obstinate opposition. But ultimately he may be enthroned. He acquires then a personal authority; his declarations attract attention and command respect; his approval gives value to conclusions and reputation to investigators; his *non placet* discredits a reported discovery and crushes an eager aspirant for scientific honors; even beyond the dominion peculiarly his own his word becomes a power. Thus the language in which the faculty of the University of Berlin plead for the retention of Helmholtz approaches that of worship. "This one man's judgment," they assure the minister of education, "is

of peculiar value and not to be compensated for even by the sum of the judgments of us remaining specialists, because precisely in those questions that come before our entire faculty we need one who unites in his mind all the various branches of knowledge and perceives alike their distinct significance and their inseparable interdependence." What must have been the intellectual power and the moral grandeur of the man! Such eminence is solitary. The monarch of such a court has become verily a vicar of God, and unless he were inwardly divine such an enthronement would become baleful. How absurd, then, to claim it for every seeker after truth! How much more absurd to claim it for every pretender in scientific research! "There is a marshal's stuff in every soldier's knapsack" was Napoleonic rhetoric; "an open career for genius" was Napoleonic wisdom. There is a position of authority in science open to those only that enter in at the strait gate, but there be few that find it; to those that keep the narrow way, but there be few that walk therein. What, then, are we to say to those who are insisting so vociferously that the final authority in religion resides in each man's conscience? Tell them, surely, that they are talking sense or nonsense according to what they mean. If they mean that the individual, and he only, must describe his religious experience, tell them that no one thinks of denying it. But if they mean that the individual is the final judge of the range and significance of all possible religious experience, or even the final judge of the conclusions to be derived logically from his own, tell them that they are chattering folly. If they mean that the individual must either accept the religious guide chosen for him or choose one for himself, tell them that this is admitted universally. But if they mean that the individual is to determine for himself each and every problem that his guide must master, tell them they are talking pure absurdity.

What actually happens is this: One accepts the church of one's country or one's parents or one chooses a church for oneself; the Presbyterian becoming an Episcopalian, the Anglican a Roman Catholic, the Methodist a Unitarian. Or one chooses a religious teacher—a Wesley, a Martineau, or a Spurgeon. Or one selects himself to be his own guide. "Surely," it will be urged, "when

one chooses a church one chooses a creed also?" Only *impliciter*, as Cardinal Newman said of the ignorant Roman Catholic, not *expliciter*. And what is true of the Roman Catholics is true of the great body of Protestants. They accept their creeds *impliciter* only. They do not understand them as the scientific theologian understands them; they have vague notions of their significance, of their history, or of the grounds on which they rest. "Surely, though, Protestants accept the Bible?" Only *impliciter*, I reply. They are incapable of understanding its contents in detail; they are incapable of investigating its history and, in many cases, of understanding either its narratives or its reasonings. The Protestant accepts the Bible as containing "all things necessary to salvation," but he knows that he cannot explain much else that it contains. He must choose an interpreter or undertake the task himself. And in the latter case he must be fitted for it by some natural or supernatural process. "Surely the ethical culturist accepts the conclusions of ethical science?" Only *impliciter*. "To preach ethics is easy, to find a ground for morality extremely hard," writes Von Hartmann. Who is your ethical culturist that he should sit in judgment upon systems of morality, upon ethical principles and deductions? He is frequently incompetent to determine whether his lecturer's principles are constant or variable, whether he has any principles or is in the show business. Mark! It is not contended that the individual may not by a proper training become competent to deal with the problems of theology; much less is it contended that he may not easily understand and apply the truths that are necessary to salvation. What is denied is that he can be a judge before he becomes competent of difficult propositions that are not necessary to his salvation.

Let me illustrate. I have trouble with my eyes. I go to a renowned oculist. He gives me a pair of spectacles that change for me the aspect of the world. I know nothing of the principles of their construction. The maker of them knows only how to read the oculist's formula and how to apply it to his lenses. The oculist himself must know far more; but even he has no such complete knowledge of physiological optics as has been acquired by the master minds upon whose discoveries the progressive skill

of every oculist depends. Now, must I, the patient, insist upon mastering all the problems of physiological optics before I continue to use my spectacles? Or—to turn the thing round—shall I be silly enough to maintain that because I am helped by the spectacles I am an expert in physiological optics? Shall, then, the man who accepts Jesus as his Saviour, and finds in him deliverance from sin, refuse to follow him farther until he has mastered all the problems of biblical history or theological research? Or shall he, because he has been saved through a simple faith in Christ, imagine himself an expert in the science of theology? Surely either would be absurd. The individual Christian needs knowledge for the problems of life; it is the task and the splendid privilege of his well instructed guide to furnish him that knowledge. Dabblers in the science of religion, especially in the psychology of religion, are doing no small mischief by the loose way in which they talk of religious experience. It is undoubtedly true that religious experience is the subject-matter of the science of religion, but only in the sense in which sensations of tone are the subject-matter of acoustics. Experience of sound is normal in the average man, subnormal in the music-deaf, supernormal in the great musicians. It takes all this experience to make the basis for a science. So in a science of religion. One may say, I have such and such experiences; another may say, I have nothing of the kind. Both witnesses must be respected, but beyond these statements of experience the authority of neither goes. He may indeed reveal his experience to another, just as the man of superior sight may reveal an unperceived object to a less fortunate friend. But he can never compel another to perceive it. Can there, though, be a greater absurdity than to say that the failure to perceive a phenomenon by one man destroys it for another? Must we, for instance, strike out all the supernormal perceptions in order to have pure science? The very opposite is true. There is, therefore, no necessary antithesis between a religion of experience and a religion of authority. For there is in the science of theology the same kind of authority that there is in every science. Here as in the other sciences the subnormal must defer to the normal and the normal to the supernormal. When it is a question of the pos-

sible contents of the religious consciousness the whole range and variety of religious experience must be explored. Here, as in the other sciences, the explanation of experience must be with those who have it in all its wealth and intensity and who are at the same time competent to treat it with logical proficiency. Here, as in the other sciences, the giants will prevail and the greatest of them will dwell in light unapproachable. Here, too, the common man will live and thrive upon the fruit of investigations that he cannot pursue. We have had the authority of popes, bishops, councils, and synods; we have had the authority of individuals and of sects; but never have we had in religion the kind of authority to which in the exact sciences we are learning to defer. Some day, let us hope, there will be an assembly of competent saints, a company of elect souls, of minds endowed with gifts and grace so wonderful that all honest inquirers will turn to them for light and guidance in every spiritual and ethical difficulty.

Let us beware of telling young people that their consciences are the sole and final authority in the science of theology. Let us distinguish between those things which though hidden from the wise and prudent are revealed to babes and those things which in their very nature are accessible only to the powerful and instructed mind. Let us beware of deferring, as authorities, to those that have no respect for reason and in the arrogance of self-willed ignorance deliver judgments upon questions of which they have not even elementary knowledge. Such judgments, whether uttered by Judge Lynch or by a General Council, are sure to be reversed, but the mischief that they cause is irreparable. The history of theology abounds with them, and hence the profound distrust with which the Christian teacher has to deal. Those, therefore, who are charged with fixing the limits within which the mind of a great organization shall have free course are solemnly bound to be sure of their own competency. For nowhere can incompetency be more criminal than in such a tribunal. It was such a tribunal that crucified the Lord of life and glory.

Charles J. Little

ART. IV.—THE QUESTION OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

THE development to which attention will be given in this essay has occurred since the beginning of the nineteenth century. In determining, however, the starting point for that development, and the dogmatic postulates by which it has been conditioned, a brief review of the antecedent judgments on the character of the Sacred Scriptures will be necessary.

1. *Authoritative Decisions respecting the Bible.*—Three councils, the ecumenical character of each of which is unchallenged in the Roman Catholic Church, have given in more or less specific terms their verdict on the nature of the Bible. The first in order of these was the Council of Florence. At a session held in 1441, Eugenius IV, with the approbation of the council, declared: "The Roman Church professes one and the same God as author of the Old and the New Testament, that is, of the Law and the Prophets and the Gospel, since the saints of both Testaments spoke by the inspiration of the same Spirit." The Council of Trent, near the middle of the sixteenth century, affirmed in somewhat more specific terms the conception of the Bible which had been asserted at Florence. After referring to the body of sacred books and apostolic traditions in the custody of the church, the council added: "The synod, following the example of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and the New Testaments—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as those concerned with morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession." In nearly equivalent terms the Vatican Council of 1869-70 rendered judgment on the nature of the Bible. Referring to the list of books accepted by the earlier council, it declared: "These the church holds to be sacred and canonical not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterward approved by her authority,

nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the church herself." To this declaration the council subjoined the following canon: "If anyone shall not receive as sacred and canonical the books of Holy Scripture entire, with all their parts, as the holy Synod of Trent has enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired, let him be anathema." It is noteworthy that each of the three councils speaks without qualification of God as the author of the sacred books—language which naturally implies that the divine agency was perfectly controlling in the preparation of the Scriptures, the human agents having taken no such part as could in any way affect the authority of aught within the limits of the canon. In line with this implication is the manner in which one of the councils describes the canonical books as having all been dictated by the Holy Ghost; also the manner in which another of the councils speaks of the canonical books as containing revelation without any admixture of error and as having been written, every one of them, by divine inspiration. With obvious warrant we may say that the language of the councils is precisely such as men believing in an inerrant Bible, and wishing to declare for the same, might have been expected to use in formulating their doctrine of the Scriptures. In order to confirm the conclusion that the members of these councils meant to declare for a universally inspired and completely inerrant Bible we will take note of the opinions which have been expressed by individual exponents of Roman Catholic teaching from the mediæval period onward. Naturally testimony can be admitted here from only a few of those who have expressed themselves upon the theme in hand.

The great thirteenth century scholastic, Thomas Aquinas, whom Leo XIII industriously proclaimed as the model theologian and philosopher, took ground which must be regarded as excluding from the Bible every element of errancy. Not only did he cite approvingly the confident belief of Augustine that no one of the sacred writers has committed any error in writing;¹ he also as-

¹ Sum. Theol. I. I. 8.

sumed such a facile control by God of the prophet or sacred writer as logically would place his falling into error entirely out of question.¹ Melchior Canus, who wrote about the time of the Council of Trent, treating specifically of the supposition that errors may be found in the Bible, declared emphatically that the supposition must be rejected, that every part of the sacred canon is inspired, and that no error, even of a trivial character, can be acknowledged to have place within its limits.² Bellarmine, the famous dogmatist of the early part of the seventeenth century, while holding that the nonprophetical portions of the Bible may not have been dictated outright, claimed even for these portions a measure of divine assistance which prevented the intrusion of any error.³ Like his predecessor of the seventeenth century, Perrone, who wrote near the middle of the nineteenth century, placed limits upon the province of dictation, but like him also assumed a measure of divine influence which rendered the sacred books entirely free from error—*immunes a quavis vel levi erroris labe*.⁴ Quite as absolutely as any one of those who have been cited Leo XIII declared for the complete immunity of the sacred books from errors. Indeed a more stalwart theory of inerrancy has scarcely ever been asserted than that contained in the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893). The following are a few of its sentences: "All the books in their entirety which the church receives have been written in all their parts by the dictation of the Holy Spirit; so far in truth is it from being possible that any error should coexist with divine inspiration, that such inspiration by itself excludes and rejects error, and that necessarily, inasmuch as God the supreme Truth cannot be the author of any error. . . . That the Holy Spirit appropriated men as instruments makes no difference; as if, forsooth, something could proceed, not from the primary author, but from the inspired writers. For the Holy Spirit by a supernatural virtue so excited and moved them to the task of writing, and was so present with them in writing, that all those things which he might command, and those alone, they both rightly conceived in their minds, and wished faithfully to write, and appropriately expressed

¹ Sum. Theol. II. ii. 171. 6; II. ii. 172. 3, 4.

² De Locis Theologicis, II. 16-18.

³ Disputat. de Controversa, De Verbo Dei, I. 15.

⁴ Prælect. Theol. Pars II. Sect. I, De Sacra Scriptura, cap. ii.

with infallible truth." Such language has great force taken simply as a testimony to the sense of the Vatican decree which was cited above, and which the Pope himself mentions as warranting his own exposition of the nature of the Bible; for Leo XIII must be supposed to have been well assured as to the tenor of thought in the Vatican Council. But of course the distinguished pontiff figures here as something more than a witness. While the weight of an *ex cathedra* dogmatic determination cannot be assigned to the teaching of the encyclical, and while accordingly it cannot strictly bind the thinking of Roman Catholics, it does, in virtue of the administrative supremacy of the Pope, impose an obligation as respects giving expression to thought in speech and writing. To openly contravene what the supreme pastor has set forth for the guidance of Christendom would distinctly collide with the Roman Catholic principle of obligatory obedience. Since the unequivocal pronouncement of Leo XIII voices closely associated with Roman orthodoxy have spoken in similar terms. Thus the eminent dogmatist Heinrich writes: "The Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament are not sacred and divine writings merely because through the special assistance of God they are free from error, but because they were written by that aid of the Holy Spirit which is called inspiration, in virtue of which God himself is the author not only of the truths contained in Holy Writ, but also of their expression in writing, although by the mediation and service of the sacred writers."¹ In the same connection he adopts the figure of Augustine, according to which the Holy Spirit ruled the sacred writers as the head rules the members.

In recent numbers of the noted Jesuit organ at Rome, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, which for a generation has usually been in line with a triumphant Roman orthodoxy, strong ground has been taken on the necessity of maintaining the traditional view of biblical inerrancy. The supposition of Newman that the Bible may contain *obiter dicta*, that is, some incidental items which a writer has recorded on his own responsibility, is treated as inadmissible. Newman, says the critic, may have applied the notion of *obiter dicta* to trivial matters; but once the notion is admitted it cannot

¹ *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, pp. 53, 54.

be confined to that range. The warrant of inspiration must be claimed for everything in the Bible. Neither will it do to admit with Monseigneur d'Hulst that in some matters the inspiration was so far restricted as not entirely to secure the sacred writers from mistake: "The two expressions 'God says' and 'the sacred writer says' are absolutely synonymous. . . . If the Catholic tradition is not a chimera, if the unanimous consent of the fathers is not an empty term, if the constancy, the perpetuity, and the universality of a doctrine constitute a rule of faith, there is no Catholic dogma more solidly established than the infallibility of the Scriptures."¹

From the above it appears that, while the theory of dictation proper has not uniformly been applied by Roman Catholic writers to the entire canon, it has been characteristic of the more representative theologians to assert the detailed inerrancy of the Bible. No room is therefore left for real doubt as to the sense which the councils designed to express in the decrees which have been cited. Now these decrees are of infallible authority for the Roman Catholic Church; and they must be reckoned infallible in the sense of their authors, otherwise the subsequent interpreter rather than the ecumenical council would need to be rated as the organ of infallibility. It follows, therefore, that the Roman Catholic Church is under the bonds of infallible dogmatic teaching to maintain the complete inerrancy of the Bible.

2. *The Progress of Freer Views respecting the Bible.*—The initial incentive in this direction came from the discoveries of natural science. Geological data served as the entering wedge, and the task of reconciling these data with the creation narrative in Genesis was for a time a principal source of divergence from the strict traditional standpoint. The boldness of the Austrian archaeologist and biblical student Jahn, in qualifying the historical character or purpose of the books of Job, Jonah, Judith, and Tobit, was quite unparalleled in the first part of the nineteenth century. As respects also the creation narrative, it was with no little reluctance that Roman Catholic scholars gave place to modifications of the old theory. The conclusion that creation occurred in six literal days was largely held in the middle of the century, but

¹ Article entitled *La Questione Biblica nell' Esgesi*, 18th series, vol. vii, pp. 142-156.

at this date a footing had been gained for the competing theory that the days stand for periods. The supposition that the Genesis narrative cannot well be reconciled with the data of science, though broached at an earlier point, cannot be said to have been given any noteworthy consideration before the last quarter of the century. In 1881 Bishop Clifford, of England, in a contribution to the *Dublin Review*, wrote disparagingly of attempts to reconcile the Bible with geology, and expressed the conviction that the first chapter of Genesis could more properly be described as a creation hymn than as a veritable history. "If we attempt," he said, "to fasten on the words of Moses a meaning in conformity with the discoveries of modern times, the attempts to reconcile Scripture with geology are not likely to be more successful than were the former attempts to reconcile Scripture with astronomy. Will anybody venture to assert that the study of Genesis has ever led to the discovery of a single geological fact? A revelation which reveals nothing, what useful object can it be supposed to serve?" For the time being Bishop Clifford's interpretation received a rather cold welcome.¹ Meanwhile a conviction began to be generated among Roman Catholic scholars that a wider task was making its demands upon them than the reconciling of the first chapter of Genesis with geology—the task of construing the Bible in the light of the findings of historical and literary criticism. For a considerable interval the modern critical theories were met by them in the spirit of scornful repudiation and without any industrious attempt at refutation. But at length these theories began to make their impression, and individual scholars had the courage and independence to award them a guarded expression. Among the earliest of these was Lenormant, who published in 1880 the first volume of his *Les Origines de l'Histoire*. In this work he took the ground that the early narratives of Genesis reproduced the common Semitic traditions, only giving them in a version transfused with a lofty ethical and religious spirit. He also expressed the conviction that it was no longer possible to maintain unity of authorship for the Pentateuch. These were strange views to the

¹ The facts are given by Albert Houtin, *La Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France au xix^e Siècle*, 2d Edit. 1902, pp. 110-113. Several of the items which follow are based in whole or in part on this very painstaking book.

average Roman Catholic scholar of the time. They claimed, however, some sympathy. Men like the Abbé de Broglie and Monseigneur d'Hulst, if they did not commit themselves specifically to the views of Lenormant, indicated their conviction that the theory of the strict constructionists made unnecessary trouble in dealing with the Bible, and that a broader theory would better suit the demands of scholarship and piety. About a decade after the publication of the first volume of Lenormant's historical work it became evident that the professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris, the Abbé Loisy, was quite friendly to the newer criticism. In articles¹ that appeared in 1892-93 he intimated his agreement with Lenormant on the indebtedness of Genesis to Babylonian sources. He also gave distinct emphasis to the fact that there is a human side to the Bible as well as a divine, declared it quite aside from the purpose of the sacred writers to serve as expositors of the themes of natural science, and attributed to them a very considerable measure of accommodation to the viewpoints of their own age. He mentioned, moreover, the cardinal conclusions of Protestant criticism—such as the presence of legendary elements in the early narratives of Genesis and the post-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch in its present form—and, while he did not formally commit himself to these conclusions, urged that they deserved a more careful consideration than had been accorded to them by Roman Catholic scholarship. Later in the same decade he made still more evident his substantial acceptance of what he here set forth as the findings of Protestant criticism. Within the last two or three years, as will be shown presently, he has given expression to views so radical, especially in relation to the New Testament domain, that he must be regarded as having parted company even with the liberal school in his own church. Shortly after Loisy began to publish his views others were ready to show that they were favorably disposed toward some of the main conclusions of the later criticism. At the Catholic International Congress held in Fribourg in 1897, Baron von Hügel, of England, and Father Lagrange, of the School of Biblical Studies at Jerusalem, presented papers in which, though

¹ Republished with additional articles under the title *Études Bibliques*.

they were careful to assert the presence of a supernatural element in the history of Israel, they argued for the progressive development of the legal system of the Pentateuch, and for the composite character and post-Mosaic origin of the literature in which that system is embodied. In January of the next year the paper of Lagrange appeared in the *Revue Biblique*, of which he was the director. Its publication was regarded by many as a scandal, and there was talk of suppressing the Review. But still it is in evidence that the critical standpoint represented in the papers of Von Hügel and Lagrange was able to claim adherents in not a few of the branches of the Roman Catholic constituency. At the congress in Fribourg the former mentioned, as occupying substantially the same standpoint, Bickell in Germany, Van Hoonacker at Louvain, Robert Clarke and Van den Biesen in England.¹ To this list F. E. Gigot authorizes us to add the names of Von Hummelauer and Charles Robert. As for Gigot himself (professor of Sacred Scripture in Saint Mary's Seminary, Baltimore), he frankly confesses his acceptance of the more characteristic conclusions of recent Pentateuchal criticism. Referring to the consensus achieved in this field by nineteenth century scholarship, he says: "Owing to this wonderful agreement of scholars concerning the main lines of critical analysis of the Hexateuch, it may safely be asserted that in connection with them, as in connection with those admitted by specialists in historical geology, future work, instead of reversing, will confirm them."² The professor also indicates his willingness to retrench somewhat from the strictly historical character of the early Genesis narratives, though speaking with considerable reserve on this theme. With Gigot we may associate another writer of French antecedents, Joseph Bruneau.³ Additional names might doubtless be added to this list. We should not transgress the proper limits of our theme if we should mention advocates of evolu-

¹So reported by Loisy, *Études Bibliques*, pp. 89, 90. The reference does not imply that all these scholars, or indeed any one of them, can be said to have accepted the Graf-Wellhausen scheme without reserve. Van Hoonacker, for instance, in his *Le Sacerdoce Lévitique*, 1900, exhibits an interest to maintain a relatively early origin for the characteristic provisions respecting sanctuary and priesthood in Israel.

²Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament, p. 140.

³The list of authors to whom Professor Bruneau refers in the footnotes of his *Harmony of the Gospels* is significant of a certain mental affinity with the liberal school.

tion theory, such as Leroy and Zahn, since their teaching may be considered to touch on the field of biblical interpretation. It would not be entirely amiss also to mention such an earnest advocate of "Americanism," among German Roman Catholics, as Herman Schell; for he has spoken very emphatic words in behalf of liberty of investigation, and strongly commended the need of a more hospitable attitude, on the part of his church, toward modern thought and methods.¹ On the whole, judging from the character and relations of those who have expressed themselves more or less directly on the side of the later criticism, we may infer that this criticism has now an appreciable constituency in the domain of Roman Catholicism. Still, anyone who has measured properly the enormous force of tradition in the Roman Catholic communion will not be in haste to conclude that the great body of the priesthood has yet been affected to any considerable extent by the new teaching.

In giving expression to their critical theories Roman Catholic scholars of the liberal school have generally felt the need of being on guard against colliding with the doctrine of biblical inerrancy so clearly implied in the decrees of the councils and so unequivocally taught in the encyclical of Leo XIII. The modest provision for an element of errancy which Newman furnished in his supposition of *obiter dicta*² has not commanded their open assent; much less have they been ready to express approval of such a broad and emphatic assertion of errancy as was made by another English Romanist.³ Men as far from the traditional platform as Loisy and Lagrange showed a distinct inclination to conserve the doctrine of inerrancy. They could not, of course, deny the existence of apparent discrepancies, and it was only left to them to maintain that these would vanish if we could transfer ourselves to the standpoint of the sacred writers and take a just account of their intention. Thus Loisy wrote: "The sacred books have been inspired to be true; but they have also been inspired to be that which

¹ We refer in particular to his book entitled *Der Katholicismus als Princip des Fortschritts*.

² *The Nineteenth Century*, February, 1884.

³ In articles published anonymously in the *Contemporary Review*, April, 1893, April, 1894. The tone of these articles is caustic and might be called audacious if the writer had given his name.

they are, books adapted to the needs of the time when they appeared, books drawn up in the spirit and manner of antiquity. . . . If we place ourselves at the point of view of theology, it can be said that the biblical authors were not deceived in the domains where we find them at fault, since they did not have a formal intention to teach as true in itself that which we find erroneous."¹ Within limits this is no doubt a legitimate rule of judgment, but it cannot be used to dispose of the whole question of errancy in the Bible without great arbitrariness. In saying some things under the guise of ancient stories the biblical writers may indeed have had as little of historical intention as Christ had in uttering parables. In very many of their sayings the element of historical intention may have been quite subordinate to that of moral and religious edification, but in however subordinate measure the former element was present and operative. Who, for example, can deny that some of the biblical writers intended to record chronological data, and that the Old Testament as a whole incorporates by the design of its compilers a certain framework of chronology? Accordingly, if the Hebrew chronological scheme is subject, in the light of archæological and scientific research, to serious amendment there was to that extent a failure on the part of the Old Testament authors to fulfill their intention. The errors may have been of very slight consequence from the point of view of religion; but to refuse to call them errors is to abuse language and resort to unseemly evasion. Further illustration could easily be offered. The scholars just cited are forcing an outlet where none exists. Not only is critical method likely to uncover an error here and there in matters of detail; one or another of the general conclusions reached by modern criticism distinctly involves an element of errancy in the Bible. Though that criticism may take nothing out of the Old Testament which has permanent worth for the mind and heart of man, it does modify the conception of the evolution of the ancient religion which ruled the thought and pen of some Old Testament writers. To speak more specifically, it exhibits the later compilers or editors of the legal system as giving (presumably with honest intent) a more direct association of that sys-

¹ *Études Bibliques*, pp. 18, 19, 56.

tem with the age and the person of Moses than was warranted by the actual history. It necessitates, therefore, the recognition of an element of mistaken representation. For the Roman Catholic scholar to acknowledge this much may seem a desperate step; but there is no escape if he is to hold by the critical theories in question. These theories cannot be harmonized with the dogma of inerrancy which has been enthroned by the councils and promulgated in the encyclical.

It was noticed above that in his more recent writings Loisy has pushed on to a radical type of criticism. He represents in truth at this later stage a criticism which is open to more or less challenge from the Protestant standpoint and is distinctly incompatible with the Roman Catholic system as ordinarily understood. Not only does he place the fourth gospel quite outside the category of history; he very seriously retrenches the historicity even of the synoptical gospels. In reality he applies Newman's theory of doctrinal development to the apostolic age itself, and so represents much of the content of the New Testament as the product of an evolution from humble and obscure beginnings. He brings even the dogmas of the church under the law of universal flux, and intimates that they can survive only by having an improved and improving interpretation put upon them. Much of what he says about the origin of the Roman Catholic dogmatic and ceremonial system may lie close to the actual facts, but his conclusions, in spite of his pleas to the contrary, are evidently damaging to the claims of that system. Naturally the expression of such sentiments has elicited rebuke from liberals as well as from conservatives in Roman Catholic ranks. Referring to the book entitled *L'Évangile et l'Église*, in which Loisy presumes to defend the Roman Catholic faith as against Harnack's interpretation of Christianity,¹ Lagrange scores his confrère as proceeding by the way of a *a priori* construction rather than by that of real criticism, and as bringing danger rather than safety to the Catholic system by the method of his apology. He contends that on several important points Loisy differs from Harnack for the worse, and that in

¹ Embodied in *Das Wesen des Christentums*, translated under the title, "What is Christianity?"

general his theories are no more compatible with the Christian faith than are those of the distinguished German¹—a statement which of course amounts to a very severe animadversion from the Roman Catholic point of view. Indeed it looks as if Loisy, on account of his radicalism, had largely forfeited the opportunity to shape the critical movement in his own church, much as certain extremists in Protestant ranks have forfeited the office of guidance and ceased to be of any noteworthy significance, except as their example affords aid and comfort to those who are in search of proof that the whole movement in biblical criticism is of the devil.

3. *The Official Response to the Freer Views.*—The tenor of that response can be seen in the following list of historical items: In 1822 four books of Jahn were placed in the Index of Prohibited Writings; and it is to be noticed that they stood in the list of proscribed books through the century and were retained in the revised edition of the Index published in 1900 with the approbation of Leo XIII. In 1848 the book of Frederick Klee on the deluge, in which he ventured to express the opinion that it is difficult to suppose that no others of the human race besides the family of Noah survived the catastrophe, was placed in the Index. It also appears in the revised edition. In 1886 the Abbé Duchesne, teacher of ecclesiastical history in the Catholic Institute at Paris, who was friendly to the more liberal scholarship but not apparently given to any very radical theories, was suspended for a year by the diocesan administration from his course of instruction. In December, 1887, the first two volumes of Lenormant's *Les Origines de l'Histoire* were put into the Index of Prohibited Writings; also the first two parts of Ledrain's *Histoire d'Israel*. The same fate befell Lasserre's translation of the gospels into French, although it had been issued under ecclesiastical sanction and so far met a popular demand that it passed through twenty-five editions in the space of little more than a year.² These three works appear in the revised edition of the Index.

¹ *Revue Biblique*, April, 1903. Among others who have written in criticism of the views of Loisy are the author of a series of articles in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Cardinal Perraud, Palmieri, Pègues, and Frémont. Our opportunity for perusal has been confined to the first three of these. Their estimate of Loisy's teaching is distinctly condemnatory.

² Houtin, *La Question Biblique*, pp. 130-135.

In 1893 Loisy, who had been teaching in the Catholic Institute of Paris for twelve years, was deprived of his chair of instruction by the episcopal council which had in charge the administration of the Institute. A little later came the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* from Leo XIII, the publication of which is properly mentioned here since obviously it was designed to assert the strict traditional standpoint against the teaching of Loisy and others. In 1895 Father Leroy, who had written a book in favor of evolution theory, was cited to Rome, and was constrained to retract. Near the close of 1898 Professor Schell's *Der Katholicismus als Princip des Fortschritts*, along with several other books of the same author, was placed in the prohibited list. In 1899 Father Zahm, an American professor, was constrained by ecclesiastical mandate to withdraw from circulation the book which he had published in favor of evolution theory. At the revision of the Index in 1900 the works of Richard Simon, whom Gigot mentions as a pioneer in a truly scientific study of the Bible, were continued in the list of prohibited books, alongside an ample catalogue of the most illustrious of modern productions in philosophy and history. In December of 1903 the Congregation of the Holy Office condemned five writings of the Abbé Loisy¹—a censure much less significant than some others on account of certain items of radical and adventurous teaching in the condemned books. At the same time the Congregation of the Index condemned the Abbé Houtin's *La Question Biblique*, a book which seems to be chargeable with no other fault than that of extraordinary candor and openness in describing the progress of liberal thought among the Roman Catholics of France and the effort to checkmate the same.

With such a line of facts under observation one is compelled to conclude that whatever progress has been made in the Roman Catholic Church, in the appropriation of the fruits of recent biblical criticism, has been made under the frown rather than under the favor or even tolerance of official authority. It may be remembered, it is true, that Leo XIII, in October, 1902, instituted a "Commission for the Development of Biblical Studies," making

¹ *La Religion d'Israel; L'Évangile et l'Église; Études Évangéliques; Autour d'un Petit Livre; Le Quatrième Évangile.*

up the commission from the cardinals, and joining with them as consulters certain scholars from outside. Some have interpreted this act as being of the nature of a pontifical concession to liberal scholarship. The warrant for such interpretation, however, is very slight. Nothing in the public utterances of Leo XIII indicates that he retreated from the ultra-conservative position taken in the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*. The evidence runs the other way. Thus in a letter of the Pope to the French clergy, bearing date September 8, 1899, he wrote: "On the subject of the Holy Scriptures, we call anew your attention, venerable brothers, to the instructions which we have given in our encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, in which we desire the professors to instruct their pupils, adding the necessary explanations." Furthermore, in the opening statement of the "apostolical letter" for appointing the commission, Leo XIII mentions the encyclical, and at another point in the same document clearly expresses the expectation that the commission will follow along the lines which, in conformity with the traditional teaching, he had marked out. "In what concerns," he says, "the rounded assertion of the authority of the Scriptures the members of the commission should employ an active care and keen diligence. Especially should they labor for this end, that no place should be given among Catholics to that obnoxious way of thinking and acting which concedes too great weight to the heterodox, just as if the real knowledge of Scripture is to be sought first of all from the equipment of outside learning. Nor, indeed, can those things to which we have referred more at length elsewhere be doubtful to any Catholic—to wit, that God has not committed the Scriptures to the private judgment of the learned, but has passed over the interpretation of them to the authority of the church." Probably the commission was designed to be rather an instrument for calming agitation and for holding Catholic thought in leash than to serve as a means of inaugurating anything like a new departure in dealing with the great question of biblical criticism. If it was in the mind of the pontiff to make any concessions to freedom of investigation, these, in all likelihood, were after the pattern of the indulgence which was granted

¹ Cited by Houtin, p. 273.

in connection with the revised plan for the prohibition of books—just enough to give a show of liberality while yet the old scheme of surveillance and control was maintained without essential abatement. What Pius X will do with the commission remains, of course, to be seen. It is to be presumed that his sympathies are quite decidedly with the traditional standpoint. It is possible however, that he may prefer not to assert them in the unrestrained manner of his predecessor. Thus far he seems to have fallen short of the intemperate ambition of Leo XIII to act the pedagogue for the world in general.

4. *The Probable Outcome.*—It has been seen that the Roman Catholic Church, on a fair interpretation of its standards, is committed to the doctrine of the detailed inerrancy or infallibility of the Bible. It has been seen, also, that critical theories which must rationally be considered incompatible with that doctrine have been forcing their way through the closed doors of that church to an extent which makes it clear that they cannot easily be kept out. What is to be the final result? The answer rendered to this question will naturally be dictated by the conception which one entertains of the critical movement of recent times. Anyone who is intrenched in the seventeenth century notion of the Bible, and who looks upon nineteenth century criticism as the product either of an unbridled appetite for novelty or of a foolish overestimate of contemporary science, may well conclude that a saner age will leave no place to that criticism; and that consequently it will cease to make any real problem for the Roman Catholic Church. On the contrary, one who believes that the modern critical movement is to a considerable extent solidly based in facts, and has reached certain leading conclusions which can no more be set aside in the consensus of free scholarship than the once decried Copernican theory, will be compelled to believe that the Roman Catholic Church must continue to face the fact of a distinct antagonism between the unequivocal demands of doctrinal standards and the equally unequivocal demands of biblical scholarship.

The writer of this article is fulfilling in the present instance the office of the historian rather than that of the dogmatist. If, however, anyone asks to which of the two conclusions just sketched

his own judgment inclines, he has no hesitation in saying that it coincides with the second. Such study as he has been able to make both of the Bible and the course of modern thought during thirty years of scholastic occupation has led him to entertain these convictions: 1. The Bible is indeed the book of books in the wealth of its content for the guidance and inspiration of life, in the adequacy of the materials which it embraces for a complete ethical and religious system, in the efficacy of the means to which it points for cleansing and healing the sin-stained, in the authentic picture which it gives of the kingdom of God, as respects its principal stages, its ideal impersonation in Jesus Christ, and its destined consummation. But, while the Bible has this lofty preëminence, it cannot claim perfection in every detail. Scientific scholarship must renounce the task of proving its complete inerrancy, in all parts and upon all matters, as being both a needless and an impossible task. 2. While much in the compass of recent critical theories is problematical, certain cardinal conclusions, such as the post-Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch and the gradual development of the legal system of Israel, with its elaborate ritual, are likely to stand the test of continued research. That system can be called Mosaic only in the general sense of proceeding from a Mosaic basis, and not in the larger and more positive sense of having been delivered directly in all its details by the great law-giver. 3. A doctrine of inerrancy, like that embodied in Roman Catholic standards, cannot be harmonized with the demands of well-approved critical theories. Holding these convictions, the writer must conclude that Roman Catholic authority, if it is not openly to deny itself, has no more likely expedient for meeting the embarrassments of the situation which it is called to face than a resort to delay, to finesse, to management, until at length in some future generation the apologist can make bold to claim that the church has always held the broader and freer view of the Bible.

H. C. Sheldon.

ART. V.—OUR EPISCOPACY—A STUDY INTO THE
DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS¹

PRIOR to 1784 the Methodists in the United States seem to have had no ordained ministry, no sacraments, and no other organization than as "The United Societies" under the direction of Thomas Rankin, whom Mr. Wesley had appointed his assistant for America. Under this organization conferences were held, the proceedings of which were published under the title "*Minutes of Some Conversations between the Preachers in Connection with Mr. Wesley.*" Jesse Lee writes of this early period that: "In 1773 Mr. Wesley sent Thomas Rankin and George Shadford to America. From that time Mr. Rankin had the superintendency of the *Methodist connection* in America, and was styled the General Assistant. He called the traveling preachers together, and on the seventeenth of July, 1773, the first Conference that ever was held in America began in Philadelphia." "About the middle of September, 1778, Mr. Rankin and Mr. Rodda left the continent and sailed for England, because Mr. Rodda's conduct brought much suffering and much trouble on the Methodist preachers and people. He had taken some imprudent steps in favor of the Tories." Lee adds, "But Mr. Asbury saw it best to abide in America, and in May, 1779, the Conference determined that Brother Asbury ought to act as General Assistant in America." Mr. Asbury's first election seems to have occurred five years before the organization of the church. Perhaps this precedent, and his desire both to conciliate the Fluvanna brethren and to secure the moral support naturally following unanimity in so grave a proceeding, suggested that his selection as General Superintendent be by the Conference of 1784. The events of the war do not seem to have discouraged the work of the Methodist preachers, but the rather to have determined the organization of an "Independent" church, which organization took place immediately after the celebrated "Bristol letter" had been delivered to "the Christmas Conference"

¹ Epochs in the following compilation—1773, 1784, 1792, 1808. Matter in quotations is from original editions in the collection of the writer.

—the proceedings of which are printed as the “Minutes of Some Conversations between the Ministers and Preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at a General Conference held in Baltimore, January, 1785.”

Jesse Lee's account of the steps taken immediately preceding this action, and evidently looking to it, is as follows: “At the British Conference held at Leeds in July, 1784, Mr. Wesley declared his intention of sending Dr. Coke and some other preachers to America. Mr. Richard Whatcoat and Mr. Thomas Vasey offered themselves as missionaries for that purpose, and were accepted. But before they sailed Mr. Wesley wrote to Dr. Coke, then in London, desiring him to meet him in Bristol, to receive fuller powers, and to bring the Rev. Mr. Creighton with him. The Doctor and Mr. Creighton accordingly met him in Bristol, where Mr. Wesley, with the assistance of Dr. Coke and Mr. Creighton, ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey presbyters for America; and did afterward ordain Dr. Coke a superintendent, giving him *letters of ordination* under his hand and seal.” These letters must have been the “fuller powers” mentioned by Mr. Wesley, for previous to this Dr. Coke had been ordained a presbyter by a bishop of the Church of England. “Dr. Coke,” he continues, “with Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey sailed for America, in the month of September, and landed at New York on the third day of November, and by these preachers Mr. Wesley wrote a letter to us in America, to be printed and circulated among us; the following is the letter:

BRISTOL, September 10, 1784.

To Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our brethren in North America.

1. By a very uncommon train of providences many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from the British Empire, and erected into Independent States. The English Government has no authority over them, either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the states of Holland. A civil authority is exercised over them, partly by the Congress, partly by the state assemblies. But no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority at all. In this peculiar situation some thousands of the inhabitants of these States desire my advice; and in compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch.

2. Lord King's account of the primitive church convinced me many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned, from time to

time, to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our traveling preachers [that is, for service in Great Britain]. But I have still refused, not only for peace' sake, *but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the Church to which I belonged.*

3. But the case is widely different between England and North America. *Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, and but few parish ministers. So that for some hundred miles together there are none either to baptize or administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end; and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending laborers into the harvest.*

4. *I have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint Superintendents over our brethren in North America. As also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them, by baptizing and administering the Lord's Supper.*

5. If anyone will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding those poor sheep in the wilderness, I will gladly embrace it. At present I cannot see any better method than that I have taken.

6. It has indeed been proposed to desire the English bishops to ordain part of our preachers for America. But to this I object, 1. I desired the Bishop of London to ordain one only; but could not prevail. 2. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceeding; but the matter admits of no delay. 3. *If they would ordain them now, they would likewise expect to govern them. And how grievously this would entangle us! As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state and from the British hierarchy we dare not entangle them again either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free.*

JOHN WESLEY.

It is apparently difficult to reconcile the expressions of the second paragraph of this letter with Mr. Wesley's known relations to the Church of England. For, as a churchman, he undoubtedly believed that the ministry of that church was constituted of three Orders. He cannot reasonably be understood as denying in so conspicuous a manner this canon of that church. What, then, did he mean? He was about to change the plan of administering the work in America from that of the directing the United Societies by his appointed assistants to that of the superintendency of an organized church by a ministry ordained for this service according to the forms of the church to which he belonged. He states in this letter that he was unable to secure such ordinations, and is explaining and defending the regularity and validity of those on which he had determined. He then states that he "was led by Lord King's account" to see that scriptural authority of both the

episcopate and the eldership to ordain was recognized by the primitive church and that this was the practice in that church. He also states that for purposes of regularity, and to avoid confusion in administration, the privilege of exercising this authority within the jurisdiction of the Church of England was limited by the canons of that church and vested exclusively in the Episcopate. He also believed, as he himself states, that within a jurisdiction having no Episcopate to which this right had been already committed, or where, having been committed, it had become in any way interrupted, the body of elders might in either case rightfully enter upon and exercise this authority and constitute anew, or reinstate, an episcopate, with power to have superintendency over a proposed or an existing church, and to ordain its ministry.

With respect, then, to scripturally recognized authority—that is, the same authority to ordain—the episcopate and the eldership were of the same order. With respect to canonically limited privilege to exercise this authority for the time being they were *not* of the same order—for the eldership was subordinate to the episcopate by this canon. In pursuance of this belief he had, with the assistance of two ordained ministers of the Church of England, ordained Dr. Thomas Coke as a Superintendent for America, and had also instructed him to ordain Francis Asbury “for the same episcopal office” in the United States.

Mr. Wesley's whole letter shows his belief to be that for purposes of regularity and order *the privilege of exercising* the right of ordination within the jurisdiction of the national church *has been limited* to the order of *bishop*. The Preface to the English Ordinal seems to indicate this to be the accepted belief of that church, for so long, at least, as that Order has a living representative within English jurisdictions. Mr. Wesley further states his belief to be that wherever the Church of England has no jurisdiction, or where the order of bishop has no officer or representative, then the order of elder may again rightfully enter upon and exercise its scriptural authority to ordain persons to orders in the ministry of a Christian church, and by ordaining a bishop thus to restore that order to its functions. This was the opinion of the great Hooker and other eminent writers of the Anglican

Church. That all this is what he means is further apparent from the sequent paragraphs, and from the closing lines, of this remarkable letter. Mr. Wesley could not have meant that "the bishop and the elder are the same order" in the sense that they enjoyed the privilege of exercising episcopal authority at the same time and place. For this would result in chaotic confusion, and is exactly what he had denied to himself as an Elder within the jurisdiction of the Church of England; and is likewise the very difference he established between Superintendents Coke and Asbury and Elders Whatcoat and Vasey before sending them to the United States. That Wesley fully recognized a distinction in orders, notwithstanding the often-quoted statement that "bishop and elder are *the same* order," and that he recognized this distinction as scriptural but not essential, admits of no denial. That such was his belief may be shown to the satisfaction of every investigator. For according to the Minutes of the Conference held by Wesley in the year 1747—one year after he had read Lord King's Inquiry, upon which the above statement of Wesley is based—the following questions and answers are found:

Q. Are the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons plainly described in the New Testament?

Ans. We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Churches of the Apostolic age.

Q. But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches in all ages?

Ans. We are not assured of this, because we do not find it is asserted in Holy Writ.

It is evident, then, that Wesley held (a) that *essentially* bishop and elder are of one order, and (b) that three orders are described, but not binding, in the New Testament, from which it follows that Wesley did believe the episcopate to be an order and to be a New Testament order.

THE CONFERENCE OF 1784

The action of this Conference—known as the Organizing Conference, the Christmas Conference, and the Organizing Convention—is printed under the following title, which should be carefully noted; namely: "*Minutes of Several Conversations between*

the Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D., the Rev. Francis Asbury, and Others at a Conference begun in Baltimore, in the State of Maryland, on Monday the 27th of December, in the year 1784. Composing a form of Discipline for the Ministers, Preachers and other members of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America." The organic act follows this title and is as follows: "*We will form ourselves into an Episcopal Church, under the direction of Superintendents, Elders, Deacons, and Helpers, according to the forms of ordination annexed to our Liturgy, and the form of discipline set forth in these Minutes.*" A close study of this act shows (a) that three separate orders of ministers are specified; (b) that the church is under their direction; (c) that the forms of ordination under which they are severally authorized to exercise this "direction" are cited; and (d) that the plan or "form of discipline" by which this church is placed under the direction of those named is also given. Lee continues:

At the same time [that of preparing the letter] Mr. Wesley prepared a liturgy little differing from that of the Church of England, or rather revised the Common Prayer Book, leaving out certain parts, and altering some of the ceremonies, and some of the psalms, and making the morning and evening service much shorter than it was before. He advised all the traveling preachers to use it on the Lord's Day in all the congregations, reading the Litany only on Wednesdays and Fridays, and to pray extempore on all other days. He also advised the elders to administer the Supper of the Lord on every Lord's Day. [It may be seriously regretted that this Liturgy should have fallen into such general disuse.]

As soon as Dr. Coke landed in America he laid his plan to meet Mr. Asbury as soon as possible, and traveling from New York to Philadelphia, and then down into the Delaware state, he met Mr. Asbury at Barratt's Chapel on the fourteenth day of the same month. They then consulted together about the plan which Mr. Wesley had adopted and recommended to us. After the business was maturely weighed, and sufficient time was taken to consult some more of the preachers who were present on that day, it was judged advisable to call together all the traveling preachers in a General Conference to be held in Baltimore at Christmas. Accordingly, the thirteenth Conference began in Baltimore, December 27, 1784, and was considered to be a General Conference, in which Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury presided.

At this Conference we formed ourselves into a regular church, by the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church; making at the same time the episcopal office elective—(not appointive)—and the elected superintendent—not "the episcopal office"—amenable to the body of ministers and preachers. [Lee doubtless had it in mind that Dr. Coke had been appointed, and that he was the only bishop whose ordination preceded election to the "episcopal office."]

Mr. Asbury was appointed a superintendent by Mr. Wesley, yet he would not submit to be ordained unless he could be voted in by the Conference: when

it was put to vote he was unanimously chosen. He was then ordained Deacon, then Elder, and afterward Superintendent, before the end of the Conference. At the request of Mr. Asbury, when he was about to be ordained a superintendent, Mr. Otterbein, a German minister, who was a pious man, assisted in his ordination by the laying on of his hands with the other ministers.

Twelve persons, Freeborn Garrettson, William Gill, LeRoy Cole, John Haggerty, James O. Cromwell, John Tunnel, Nelson Reed, Jeremiah Lambert, Reuben Ellis, James O'Kelly, Richard Ivey, and Henry Willis, were then elected and ordained Elders; and three others, John Dickins, Caleb Royer, and Ignatius Pigman, were also elected and separately ordained Deacons. These ordinations, together with those by Mr. Wesley, were undoubtedly completed "according to the forms of ordination annexed to our Liturgy," and served to complete the three orders in this Episcopal Church as required by and provided in the Liturgy referred to in the organic act it had just adopted. These forms of ordination are given in the Liturgy contained in the Sunday Service of 1784, 1786, 1788, and 1792, in the order and under the heads following. It will be noted that all the forms use the word "ordination" and not "consecration" of the bishop:

THE FORM AND MANNER OF MAKING AND ORDAINING OF SUPERINTENDENTS,
ELDERS, AND DEACONS.

- (a) The Form and Manner of Making of Deacons.
- (b) The Form and Manner of Ordaining of Elders.
- (c) The Form of Ordaining a Superintendent.

The running headline in each case is,

The Ordaining of Deacons.
The Ordaining of Elders.
The Ordination of Superintendents.

Lee continues:

In the Minutes of this Conference there were eighty-one questions with answers, a few of which I shall take notice of—(the first two are irrelevant to this study).

Q. 3. As the ecclesiastical as well as civil affairs of these United States have passed through a very considerable change by the Revolution, what *plan of church government* shall we *hereafter pursue*?

Ans. We will form ourselves into an Episcopal Church, under the direction of Superintendents, Elders, Deacons, and Helpers, *according to the forms of ordination annexed to our Liturgy*, and the form of discipline set forth in these Minutes.

Three ordinations were necessary to make a superintendent, two to make an elder, one to make a deacon. If the Episcopacy is "merely an office and not an order," it seems to have required a greater number of ordinations to fill an "office" than to make an "order." The Minutes continue:

N. B.—No person shall be ordained a Superintendent, Elder, or Deacon, without the consent of a majority of the Conference [all three of the orders then were "made elective"] and the consent and imposition of hands of a Superintendent; except in the following instance:

Q. 29. If by death, expulsion, or otherwise, there be no Superintendent remaining in our Church, what shall we do?

Ans. The Conference shall elect a Superintendent, and the Elders or any three of them shall ordain him according to our Liturgy.

The Methodists were pretty generally pleased at our becoming a church, and heartily united together in the plan which the Conference had adopted. And from that time religion greatly revived.

The Minutes of the Conferences of 1784 and 1786 reaffirm the willingness of the fathers to "obey Mr. Wesley in all matters relating to church government." It may be noted that the title to the Minutes of 1786 was changed and declares that they form the Constitution of the Church. It reads thus: "*The General Minutes of the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, forming the Constitution of the said Church.*" In the Discipline of 1787—and repeated in that of 1788—are found the Preamble, the Constitution, the directions for constituting the Ministry of the Church, and the reasons for establishing it in the United States. A section on the "*Origin of the Episcopal Authority,*" the form of constituting the Bishop, the Elder, and the Deacon, and their respective duties, is again given in the Disciplines of 1789, 1790, and 1791, as follows:

SECTION LV

ON THE CONSTITUTING OF BISHOPS AND THEIR DUTY

Q. 1. What is the proper origin of the episcopal authority in our church?

Ans. In the year 1784, the Rev. John Wesley, who under God has been the father of the great revival of religion now extending over the earth by the means of the Methodists, determined, at the intercession of multitudes of his spiritual children on this continent, to ordain ministers for America, and for this purpose sent over three regularly ordained clergy; but preferring the episcopal mode of church government to any other, he solemnly set apart by the imposition of his hands and prayer, one of them, viz., Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford, for the episcopal office; and having

delivered to him *letters of episcopal orders* ["fuller powers"], commissioned and directed him to set apart Francis Asbury, then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America, *for the same episcopal office*, he, the said Francis Asbury being first ordained Deacon and Elder. In consequence of which, the said Francis Asbury was *solemnly set apart for the said episcopal office*, by prayer and the imposition of hands of said Thomas Coke, *other regularly ordained ministers assisting* in the sacred ceremony. At which time the general conference held at Baltimore *did unanimously receive* the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury *as their Bishops*, being *fully satisfied of the validity of their episcopal ordination*.

That is to say, Dr. Coke, already an ordained elder in the Church of England, then received "fuller powers"—that is, powers of ordination and episcopal authority of which these "letters of episcopal orders" from Mr. Wesley were evidence, with directions to "set apart Francis Asbury for the same episcopal office"—after which *both* were received by the founders of the Church as *their Bishops*, "*being fully satisfied of the validity of their episcopal ordination.*" Immediately following this restatement of the historic facts, directions are given in the Disciplines of 1787, 1788, 1789 for constituting the *Elder* and the *Deacon*—the other two Orders inherent in *any* system of episcopal government and therefore necessarily so in ours, if it is "episcopal"—as follows:

SECTION IV

ON THE CONSTITUTING OF BISHOPS AND THEIR DUTY

Q. 2. How is a Bishop to be constituted *in future*?

Ans. By the election of a majority of the Conference, and the laying on of the hands of a Bishop. [Then follows the duty or "office" of the Bishop.]

SECTION V

ON THE CONSTITUTING OF ELDERS AND THEIR DUTY

Q. 1. How is an Elder constituted?

Ans. By the election of a majority of the Conference, and by the laying on of the hands of a Bishop, and of the Elders that are present. [Then follows the duty or "office" of the Elder.]

SECTION VI

ON THE CONSTITUTING OF DEACONS AND THEIR DUTY

Q. 1. How is a Deacon constituted?

Ans. By the election of a majority of the Conference, and the laying on of the hands of a Bishop. [Then follows the duty or "office" of the Deacon.]

THE ORDINATION SERVICES

These ordinations must have been conducted according to the Forms contained in "the Sunday Service and *other Occasional*

Services" of 1784, as the Ordination Service does not appear in any of the Disciplines until 1792. It then appears for the first time, and is continued without change in those of 1796, 1801, 1804, 1808, and 1812, with the exception that the name *Bishop* takes the place of "*Superintendent*" throughout the entire Ordination Service, including the Rubric. The title in the Index to the Disciplines, referring to the *Bishop*, Elders, and Deacons prior to 1792, is as follows: "Of the *Constituting of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons*." The Ordination Service itself, however, plainly says "*Ordination*" of the "*Bishops, Elders, and Deacons*," until 1864, when, after having done faithful service for eighty years, "*the ordination of Bishops*" is transformed into the "*Consecration of the Bishop*"—a term which Wesley deliberately rejected in his revision of the Service for Ordination. The elders and deacons, however, are graciously permitted to remain the undisturbed subjects of a Constitutional "*Ordination*." No explanation of this interruption in the usage of the preceding eighty years occurs until the introduction of the explanatory note at the head of the chapter in the Discipline referring to the Ordination since 1884.

THE HISTORIC STATEMENT

William Watters gives the account of all this, in his "Short Account Drawn up by Himself," as follows: "On the twenty-fifth day of December, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four, our Conference met in Baltimore, to consider the plan of church government which the Doctor (Coke) brought over, recommended by Mr. Wesley. It was adopted and unanimously agreed to with great satisfaction, and we became, instead of a religious society, a separate church, under the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church." And, in quoting from a letter he had written "To Mr. B—, March 18, 1806," he says of Mr. Asbury and this Conference: "He continued such (General Assistant) until the year 1784, when the Doctor (Coke) came over and not only the name General Assistant was changed to that of *Superintendent*, but we formed ourselves into a separate church. The change was proposed to us by Mr. Wesley, after we had craved his advice on the subject, but could not take effect until adopted by us, which was done in

a deliberate formal manner at a Conference called for that purpose, in which there was not one dissenting voice. Everyone of any discernment must see, from Mr. Wesley's circular letter on this occasion, as well as from *every part of our mode of church government*, that we *openly and avowedly declared ourselves Episcopalians*, though the Doctor and Mr. Asbury *were called Superintendents*." He then adds: "After a few years, the name was changed from Superintendent to *Bishop*. But *from first to last the business of General Assistant, Superintendent, or Bishop has been the same*." Beyond all doubt, they understood themselves to have constituted this Superintendent to be the Bishop of what they had now constituted an "*Episcopal*" Church; and that in addition they had constituted also the Order of Deacon so as to complete the ordained ministry of an "*Episcopal Church*," and that this organization was disentangled from the state and the British "hierarchy."

Freeborn Garrettson gives the following account in his *Experiences and Travels*: "Dear Mr. Wesley has granted the desires of thousands of his friends in America in sending a *power of ordination* and giving his consent to our becoming a separate church"; and "The preachers having gathered, our Conference began on Christmas Day and we acceded to the method proposed by Mr. Wesley, and men were set apart and consecrated for the *different orders* of our church."

And *Jesse Lee* gives this further account: "The Conference, begun in Baltimore, was considered to be a General Conference." "At this Conference we formed ourselves into a *regular church* by the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church." And referring to Francis Asbury he says, "He was unanimously *chosen* [superintendent] and was then *ordained* deacon, then elder, and *afterward* superintendent, before the end of the Conference."

Francis Asbury, then assistant to Mr. Wesley, gives the following account of the preliminary meeting at Barratt's Chapel in November, 1784, in his *Journal*: "I was shocked when first informed of the intention of these my brethren (Coke, Whatcoat, Vasey) in coming to this country; it may be of God. The design of organizing the Methodists into an Independent Episcopal Church was opened to the preachers present, and it was agreed to call a

Conference at Baltimore the ensuing Christmas"—to consider the intention of "these my brethren." "After stopping at Perry Hall for a few days," he says, "we then rode to Baltimore, where we met a few preachers; it was agreed to form ourselves into an *Episcopal Church* and to have *superintendents, elders, and deacons*. When the Conference was seated Dr. Coke and myself were unanimously elected to the *superintendency of the church* and *my ordination followed*, after being previously *ordained deacon and elder*, as by the following certificates may be seen." Then follows the well known "Certificate"—needless to insert—from which it appears that Mr. Asbury, having been recommended as "a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ," was "set apart for the office of a superintendent," was elected to three separate orders, and received three distinct ordinations before he reached the last and highest.

SUMMARY

These several accounts written by men who were contemporary with the Church then organized, who participated in its organization, and who remained in it until the Conference of 1808, taken together with the action of the Conferences as given in the Disciplines and Minutes, show (a) That "the United Societies" were organized into a *Church*; (b) That it was "*Independent*"—or "*Separate*"; (c) That it was "*Episcopal*"; (d) That it adopted a "*plan of government*"; (e) That it was *Mr. Wesley's Plan*," and (f) That it was called "*The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States*."

The church had become "*Independent*" and "*Separate*" according to the suggestions of the sixth paragraph of Mr. Wesley's "little sketch" of November 10, 1784, in which he says "our American brethren, having now become totally *disentangled both from the state and from the English hierarchy*, were not hereafter to become entangled either with the one or with the other."

Being now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive church, the followers of John Wesley preferred an episcopal form of government, and organized "according to Mr. Wesley's Plan," and having adopted an episcopal form of government and "openly and avowedly become Episcopalians," it was

called the *Methodist Episcopal Church*; and as it was organized for the United States it was called "*The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States*." Now, what kind of Episcopacy and what kind of an Episcopal church was this? For "the fathers" as principals, founders, and organizers had constituted and enjoyed an episcopacy which, for a quarter of a century, proved so satisfactory, that in 1808, when about to change from unlimited to limited General Conference legislative authority they permanently enjoined the *delegated* or limited General Conference in the following terms: "The General Conference shall not change nor alter any part or rule of our government so as to do away episcopacy nor destroy the plan of our itinerant General Superintendency;" since which time no changes could be made by General Conference action alone. Coke, Whatcoat, and Vasey, who, by the authority of Mr. Wesley had assisted in the organization of this church, had previously been regularly ordained to the order of elder or presbyter in the Church of England—a church which recognized three distinct orders of ordained ministers as inherent in an episcopal form of government. Under their vows they therefore assisted in ordaining a ministry for this episcopal church similar to that in which they themselves were ordained ministers, with like authority to ordain and perpetuate the succession of its bishops, elders, deacons. Whether "orders" or "offices"—by whatever name they were then known in the English Church—they must needs then and thenceforth be known in *this* "episcopal" church. For the founders of the church were either woefully ignorant of *what they* were then doing, and of the meaning of the words they then used to state what they did, or they used them intelligently to declare precisely *what they* did. If they did *not* use them in their then commonly accepted meaning; or if they failed to state with explicit distinctness in what different sense they *did* use them, were they not—*misleading*? But not a syllable is given indicating the use of the words "episcopacy" or "episcopal" in any other than the meaning commonly accepted at that time. Notions of exclusive right and apostolic origin Mr. Wesley repudiated in his Bristol letter, and the founders of our church also repudiated them when, in opposition to it, they used

the word "Moderate Episcopacy" in the preliminary declaration of their intention of 1784. Our church has never accepted the doctrine of apostolic succession, and has always repudiated "prelacy" as in any sense of divine authority. It is on *this* ground among others that Rome denies to us recognition as a church. No other than the commonly accepted meaning having been given these words by the founders of the church, whatever meaning they then had, was what was meant by their repetition in the revision of 1792 and in the Restrictive Rule of 1808; and *that kind of "episcopacy" and "episcopal government"* and the "Plan of our itinerant General Superintendency" *then in use*, is what was then legally constituted and is what the General Conference has never yet acquired the right to "do away," "destroy," "alter," or "change"—"Resolutions" to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE REVISION OF 1792

To the Conference of 1792, Jesse Lee calls special attention in these words: "On the first of November, 1792, the first *regular* General Conference began in Baltimore. Our preachers who had been received into full connection came together from all parts of the United States, where we had any circuits formed, with an *expectation that something of great importance would take place* in the connection in consequence of that Conference." What was this "something of great importance"? *Let us see.* He says, "The form of discipline was revised at that General Conference." The title-page of that edition was changed to: "The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, revised and approved by the General Conference held at Baltimore in the state of Maryland, in November 1792: in which Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury presided." In this revision not only was "the episcopal office *again* made elective," but that of the elder and the deacon also. And here again, in 1792, is a re-affirmation of the doctrine of the founders as contained in the Disciplines of 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, and 1791, with respect to the origin of our episcopacy, with respect to its authority, and with respect to the ultimate succession in our episcopacy, from any source other than that from which it came—the body of the eldership. The bishop

elect is not then a *bishop*, however; nor will he ever be, till—his election having been completed—his vows are taken, the imposition of hands is made and the final voice, invoking “The Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the church of God” completes the concrete form by which he is empowered and directed “by the authority of the church” to perform the duty of a bishop.

The Forms for ordaining these distinct orders of the ministry of our episcopal system are inserted in the Discipline for the first time in 1792 under these heads: “*The form and manner of Making and Ordaining of Bishops, Elders, and Deacons;*” (a) “*The form and manner of Making and Ordaining of Deacons*” (then follows the ordination ceremony); (b) “*The form and Manner of Ordaining of Elders*” (then follows the ordination ceremony); (c) “*The form of Ordaining a Bishop*” (then follows the ordination ceremony).

Thus it seems from a study of the Liturgy, the early authorized documents of the church, the Minutes of 1785 to 1788, the Disciplines of 1789 to 1808 inclusive, and the writings of those who assisted in the organization of the church, many of whom continued in it as ministers for many years afterward, that “the fathers” deliberately resolved to adopt and did adopt a concrete system of church government known as Episcopacy and distinctly to organize an *Episcopal Church*; that they deliberately placed it “under the direction” of three distinctly ordained grades of ministers named in the Constitution; that these were commonly known at the time as constituting three distinct orders in an ordained ministry related to an episcopal church; that the functions they were required to perform were those commonly understood as belonging to an episcopal system composed of three distinct orders of ordained ministers; that they were then commonly known as “*orders*” and not as “*offices*” in an episcopal church; that the founders did not indicate that either the name of the system, or of its ministry, or of their relation to the system, or of the functions they performed, was used in any different sense than that in which it was commonly understood at that time; that they did therefore appoint, authorize and ordain three distinct orders of ministers

for this church; that these orders in an ascending series, were, successively Deacon, Elder, and Bishop; that to each were assigned different duties, responsibilities and dignities, which advanced in an ascending series from the first to the third and highest; that those ordained to the first or lower grade could perform the duties of that order only; that each higher order *could* perform *all* those of the next lower; that each could perform, *during life*, the duties of the orders to which he had been previously elected and ordained—subject only to challenge on the ground of conduct unbecoming a Christian minister; and that this was the “episcopacy” and “the plan of our itinerant General Superintendency” which after 1808 the General Conference could neither “do away,” nor “destroy,” nor “alter,” nor “change”; a *concrete system*, to destroy any part of which was to imperil if not to destroy the whole.

It seems strange, therefore, that Episcopacy should appear to any to be “merely an office,” rather than the last and highest of three distinct “orders” of an ordained Christian ministry—which orders the church had manifestly constituted and established as necessarily *inherent* and *indispensable* in an episcopal system of church government. Having “three distinct orders of ordained ministers of which the third and highest is the bishop,” it is not inconsistent to claim that we are an episcopal church or that we really have “Episcopacy.” This view is ably set forth by Emory, Whedon, and other leading scholars and divines in our church and is that now entertained by a growing number of equally learned men of our own times.

Robert J. Miller

ART. VI.—THE SOCIAL RESURRECTION OF A GREAT PEOPLE

MORAL and social reform in India means new life to one fifth of the population of the globe. Eighteen years ago, in connection with what they call "the National Congress," a national social conference was inaugurated which has moved on, not rapidly, but somewhat cautiously, till now it means an effort at perhaps the mightiest social reform ever witnessed in such a vast mass of humanity. The eighteenth session of this conference was held in Bombay in December last. There is no longer any doubt about the radical and far-reaching consequences of this movement, and some account of this conference, which is always conducted in English, must be interesting to the student of world-wide humanity.

There was more pretense than usual in this last annual assembly. Several prominent Europeans were present on the platform at the opening, among them Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Samuel Smith, M. P., and Dr. Mackichan, a missionary, and vice-chancellor of the University of Bombay. A native ladies' conference was held separately, but related to this notable assembly, in which talented native ladies, and of high social position, took part. From this men were excluded. Distinguished native gentlemen and rulers took part in the open assembly. The Hon. Justice Chandavakar is secretary. His highness the Gaekwar of Baroda read the inaugural address, and the Hon. Mr. Gokuldas Parekh was elected permanent chairman. These all made addresses in English, which for beauty of diction, depth and justness of thought, and keen insight into the national situation could not be surpassed in any assembly in the world. Some of the speakers in the conference were native ladies, who spoke with grace and power. The writer is simply amazed at the manifestation of awakening moral life and better social purpose which has come about in his time in India. The English language has become the *lingua franca*, the nation's sad social condition has been correctly diagnosed by natives, and a resolute purpose of radical reform has been begotten.

The principal measures of the programme, which has grown up from year to year, now include (1) female education, (2) abolition of infant marriage, (3) widow remarriage, (4) abolition of polygamy, (5) removal of caste divisions, (6) intermarriage between subcastes, (7) interdining, (8) freedom of travel and sea voyages, (9) raising the position of the low castes, (10) temperance, (11) the regulation of public charities. These may be nearly all grouped under two main heads: (a) abuses arising from the caste system, and (b) abuses arising from the status of woman. Under the first come numbers 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; under the second, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4. There is no doubt that arising from the spread of enlightenment, intellectual and moral, there is a deep-felt want of this reform among the leading minds of India, chiefly among Hindus, with whom in some degree Mussulmans are associated in this movement. The chief methods of relief proposed are, (a) legislation, (b) persuasion, (c) education. The aid of the British government in checking social evils is recognized, and the help of native rulers is invoked. By the press and lectures the work of persuasion is to be carried on, and education is to be applied in schools and through subordinate social organizations as well.

We may glance at some of the statements made and resolutions passed at this session, and thus catch the general spirit and purpose and energy of this awakening. The Christian missionaries themselves could be no more indignant at the tyranny of caste, or unsparing in their denunciation of its evils, than the speakers of this assembly. The Gaekwar of Baroda said:

The evil of caste covers the whole range of social life. It hampers the life of the individual with a vast number of petty rules and observances which have no meaning. It cripples him in his relations with his family, in his marriage, in the education of his children, and especially in his life. It weakens the economic position by attempting to confine him to particular trades, by preventing him from learning the culture of the West, and by giving him an exaggerated view of his knowledge and importance. It cripples his professional life by increasing distrust, treachery, and jealousy, hampering a free use of others, and ruins his social life by increasing exclusiveness, restricting the opportunities of social intercourse, and preventing that intellectual development on which the prosperity of any class most depends. In the wider spheres of life, in municipal or local affairs, it destroys all hope of local patriotism, of work for the common good, by thrusting forward the interests of the caste as opposed to those of the community and by making combined efforts for the common good exceedingly

difficult. But its most serious offense is its effect on national life and national unity. It intensifies local dissensions and diverse interests, and obscures great national ideals and interests which should be those of every caste and people, and renders the country disunited and incapable of improving its defects or of availing itself of the advantages which it should gain from contact with the civilization of the West. It robs us of our humanity by insisting on the degradation of some of our fellow men who are separated from us by no more than the accident of birth. It prevents the noble and charitable impulses which have done so much for the improvement and mutual benefit of European society. It prevents our making the most of all the various abilities of our diverse communities; it diminishes all our emotional activities and intellectual resources. Again, it is the most conservative element in our society and the steady enemy to all reform. Every reformer who has endeavored to secure the advance of our society has been driven out of it by the operation of caste. By its rigidity it preserves ignorant superstitions and clings to the past, while it does nothing to make more easy and more possible those inevitable changes which nature is ever pressing on us.

This speaker denounced caste as standing sullenly in the way of reformers. He referred to the arrogance of the system—formerly, in some places, low-caste people were forced to sit down when superiors were passing lest their shadow might fall on the superior. This reform proposes to remove the disability which caste puts in the way of foreign travel. Earlier visitors to Europe were excommunicated from this caste on return, as were also caste fellows who may have incautiously eaten with them. The reform denounces the penance and penalties demanded for restitution to caste. In getting rid of this unhappy division of society, entailing such disabilities, the effort is being made to gradually remove caste by first eliminating its subdivisions and thus blending the community. Interdining and intermarrying among these subcastes is recommended. Strenuous efforts are advocated to improve the status of woman by pushing female education and pressing for legislation against infant marriage, encouraging the remarriage of widows, and seeking the removal of the *purdah*, or system of the seclusion of woman from society and even in a measure from members of her own family. The inaugural address states that “a too strict *purdah* mutilates social life, and makes its currents dull and sluggish by excluding the brightening influence of woman.” On the education of woman the speaker forcibly said:

By the denial of education to women we deprive ourselves of half the potential force of the nation, deny our children the advantage of having cultured mothers, and by stunting the faculties of the mother affect injuriously the heredity of the race. We create, moreover, a gulf of mental division in the home and put a powerful drag on progress by making woman a great conservative force that clings to everything old, however outworn or irrational.

One of the native ladies, Mrs. Ramabhai Mahipatram, moved a resolution against child marriage, and in her address supporting the resolution she said that social reformers would be guilty of gross negligence if they ceased to insist on the prevention of this pernicious custom until there was not a single child wife or child-mother left in this country. She submitted that the achievement sought by social reformers was not merely a philanthropic movement carried on from humanitarian motives for the protection of women and children; it was the cause of the Indian nation. She urged the government of India not to adhere to its policy of neutrality in regard to infant marriages. It had abolished the hideous customs of "suttee" and human sacrifice and legalized widow marriage. She could not see why their benevolent British government should not follow the examples of Mysore and Baroda states, and legislate on the subject of infant marriage in the interest of its subjects. There is great hope for India in this reform movement, although the country is far enough away yet from having reached a moral and social millennium. There is still a fight with hostility in some and apathy and indifference in many. As said in the assembly, with some there is plenty of beautiful talk, but action is wanting. Still it is encouraging to see that there is a realization of present evils. The Hon. Gokuldas Parekh, who was chosen president of this reform association, said:

I think it is generally admitted that our social edifice, as it exists, is not in good order. We are riddled with customs that prevent our physical development, that are causes of many ailments and bodily infirmities, that weaken our energies, lower our vitality, and shorten our lives; by customs that prevent our intellectual development by placing obstacles in the way of our acquiring learning and knowledge of arts and sciences and their application, and by customs that bring on moral degeneration by making us indifferent to the claims of justice, equality, and charity, by narrowing the range of our sympathies and making us apathetic to the wretchedness and misery in which we find a large number of our countrymen and countrywomen steeped. The problem of the social reformer is to see how to get rid of these customs.

Is there not here something in harmony with—if not inspired by—the gospel and the best Christian thought?

There is one fact in connection with this social conference which is meantime not very encouraging to the Christian missionary. In the main the speakers, while admitting in one instance the commendable zeal and activity of the missionaries as a model for them, jealously guarded against any recognition of the influence of Christianity and the work of the missionaries in this awakening. They acknowledge the influence of Rajah Ram Mohan Roy in originating the movement more than half a century ago, but seem to overlook the fact that the Rajah's course was molded by his contact with the missionaries, and that in his visit to England, where he died, he was regarded as a Christian. The real source of this awakening and purpose of reform is in the enlightenment, moral and intellectual, that has come from the coöperation of secular education and direct mission work. All these leaders show the moral effect of their contact with Christianity. The Gaekwar in his address pathetically admitted that "some causes of our social condition are other than social—some are economic; some, again, trouble us because we are uncertain what we want and cling helplessly to the old and familiar." Alas! these leaders, so far, are seeking to leave religion out of the movement, not realizing their deepest need. They are too advanced to sanction the old religion as it stands, and they do not see how to rehabilitate it. By all their wisdom they know not God, but meantime "the foolishness of preaching" goes on in their midst and tens of thousands are becoming Christian, some of them the best educated and brightest minds of the country. India as a corporate people is not to pass away as did ancient Egypt, Assyria, Greece, and Rome. Her deep soul-longings and better aspirations will find their full satisfaction some day in the Man of Calvary. The saving leaven of a new and vigorous life is now being cast in. One of these social leaders, Keshub Chandar Sen, said: "Not British cannon and bayonets rule India, but Jesus Christ."

T. J. Scott.

ART. VII.—WESLEY'S FIRST MISSIONARY, AND HIS VISIT
TO NEW ENGLAND

THE Methodist movement among the masses began in Bristol and in Kingswood, its suburb, in 1739. Bristol, London, and Newcastle-on-Tyne soon became its head centers, from out of which it spread over Great Britain and Ireland. John Wesley spent much time in Ireland, altogether about six years, making in all twenty-one visits. He had great success there among the German Palatines in Limerick County. In 1760 many of these emigrated to America and settled in New York. Several were Irish Methodists, and one, Philip Embury, was a local preacher. They seem to have largely lost their interest in both religion and Methodism until aroused by a woman of their number, Barbara Heck, who summoned them back to their duties and commanded Philip Embury to preach to them, which he at once did, in 1768. All this happened in New York city. At about the same time Robert Strawbridge, another Irish Methodist local preacher, began services in Maryland, but it is generally conceded that the first Methodist meeting was held in New York by Philip Embury. Captain Thomas Webb, barrack master at Albany, New York, heard of and attended the meetings. He became a local preacher, and was one of the founders of Methodism in America. In 1768 the American Methodists appealed to Mr. Wesley for preachers. At the Conference held in Bristol that year the cry for help was given, but no one responded. Two men present pondered it in their hearts until the next Conference, held in Leeds in 1769, when they offered themselves as missionaries for America. Meanwhile an itinerant named Robert Williams had gone there on his own responsibility, but with the consent of Wesley. He promised to work under the missionaries whom Wesley should send. The men who volunteered were Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor. Pilmoor labored faithfully for about five years and went back to England. Subsequently he returned to America and took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church, but he retained an interest in his Methodist brethren and their work to his life's end.

Richard Boardman lived, wrought, and died, a faithful Methodist. As he was the first Methodist missionary who entered New England we will get acquainted with him.

Boardman, says well sustained tradition, was born in Yorkshire, at Gillimore. He entered the ministry in 1763. He traveled in the Grimsby Circuit in England, in Limerick and Cork in Ireland, and later in the Dales Circuit in Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, England, where were, in 1790, forty-three preaching places. This was a hard circuit to travel. In January, 1769, his wife and daughter died. The parish register reads: "Burials year 1769: January 22. Mary, daughter of Richard and Olive Boardman, B. C. [that is, Barnard Castle]. 27. Olive, wife of Richard Boardman, B. C." And in the Lady Day balance sheet of the Quarterly Meeting of the same year, we find an entry of money paid to Mr. Boardman "for burin [*sic*] his wife, 2. 2. 0." Their graves, with those of other Methodist worthies, may now be seen at Barnard Castle. How much the death of his wife and child had to do with his decision to go to America we cannot say. Presumably it had a good deal to do with his offering himself at the Conference of that same year. Unfortunately for us, and unlike his companion, Pilmoor, Boardman did not wield a ready pen. He records a wonderful deliverance on his way to Parkgate, but does not tell of his sermon on the prayer of Jabez being the means of the conversion of Miss Mary Redfern, who afterward became the mother of Dr. Jabez Bunting. He received his name, Jabez, in remembrance of Boardman's text that memorable night. Mary was the means of the conversion of her brother, two of whose sons became clergymen of the Church of England and one of whose descendants was the late Dr. William Burt Pope, the scholarly Wesleyan theologian and saint. Boardman was thirty-one years of age when he came to America. "He was a good-natured, sensible man, deeply devoted, who was not afraid of hard work; but not remarkable, as was Asbury, for force of character and great administrative ability. Pilmoor was still younger, having been but four years in the itinerancy, whilst Boardman had been six years in the work. They sailed from Gravesend, near London, in August, 1769, and after a perilous voyage of nine weeks arrived at Gloucester.

ter Point, south of Philadelphia, October 24. Boardman is given the first place in the Minutes of 1769 and 1771, showing that he was Wesley's 'assistant,' or superintendent, in America. In 1770 Pilmoor's name stands first, probably by mistake. They both labored much, especially in and around New York and Philadelphia, until the Revolutionary War broke out, when, as loyal Englishmen, they returned. On January 2, 1774, they left America, after commending the Americans to God."

We are now especially interested in Boardman because he was the first Wesleyan Methodist preacher who came to New England. He came into New England and labored in Boston in 1772. Concerning this visit, as usual with him, he does not seem to have written one word. We would never have known of it but for the discovery of the long-lost records of Old John Street Church, New York, the first Methodist church in America, and for a brief statement in Jesse Lee's *Short History of the Methodists*. On page 39 Jesse Lee says, under date of 1772: "In April there was laid a plan for Mr. Joseph Pilmoor to travel to the South and Mr. Boardman to visit the North. . . . Mr. Boardman went as far to the North as Boston, and then returned to New York." The entry in Old John Street Church accounts reads: "1772, May 14. To cash paid Mr. Richard Boardman's passage to Rhode Island £1. 9. 0. 1772, May 22. Cash paid for Mr. Richard Boardman's trunk 10^s. 3d. and for Mr. Wright's 8^s." (*Lost Chapters, etc.*, p. 203.) Wakeley says that Boardman went to Providence and Boston. Boardman's work in New England still remains a lost chapter in Methodism. Light may yet break from some now hidden records of Boston, Newport, or Providence, but meanwhile we must be content with the fact of his visit, which occurred one year before the first Methodist Conference was held in America and eleven years before Jesse Lee entered the itinerancy. Boardman's walking stick is among the curios in the Methodist Historical Society in Philadelphia. It was given to Dr. Jabez Bunting. T. Percival Bunting gave it to Bishop Peck, who presented it to that society November 10, 1881. Dr. Bangs, in his *Life of Garrettson*, whose papers and Journal he had, speaking of Garrettson's visit to New England in 1787, says: "About seventeen [fifteen] years

before the visit of Mr. Garrettson Mr. Boardman, one of the European Methodist preachers, had preached in Boston and formed a small society. Not being succeeded by any minister of the same order, the society gradually diminished, so that there were only three members left." This is the fullest statement we can find of Boardman's work in New England. Before leaving America Boardman was reduced from being an "assistant," or superintendent, to a "helper."

The spirit of his work in America may be seen in one of his few letters extant. It was written to Wesley from New York in April, 1771. In it he says:

It pleases God to carry on his work among us. Within this month we have had a great awakening here. Many begin to believe the report, and to some the arm of the Lord is revealed. This last month we have had nearly thirty added to the society, five of whom have received a clear sense of the pardoning love of God. We have, in this city, some of the best preachers (both in the English and Dutch churches) that are in America; yet God works by whom he will work. I have lately been much comforted by the death of some poor negroes, who have gone off the stage of time rejoicing in the God of their salvation. I asked one on the point of death, "Are you afraid to die?" "O no," said she; "I have my blessed Saviour in my heart; I should be glad to die. I want to be gone, that I may be with him forever."

Mr. Boardman lived only about nine years after leaving America. He labored faithfully in the Methodist itinerancy until the last. His first appointment after his return was to the Londonderry Circuit, 1774-75. The years 1776-77 were spent in Cork. In 1777, we learn from a letter of John Wesley to Mr. Alexander Clark, Boardman was in Dublin, 1778-79 in Limerick, among the Palatines who had remained in Ireland. In 1780 he is in London. In 1781 he is back among the Palatines in Limerick. His last appointment was to Cork, in 1782. Here on October 4, 1782, he "his body with his charge laid down, and ceased at once to work and live." He was stricken with a fit of apoplexy on Sunday, September 29, 1782, as he was going out to dinner. The Sunday before his death he preached from "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him." He was buried in the churchyard attached to the cathedral of Saint Patrick Fin Barr, and his grave is an object of interest to Methodists from America when visiting Cork. An English Methodist thus describes a recent visit to this spot:

From the French Church we went over to old Henry Street, and then across again to Saint Patrick's Cathedral. Here Mr. Perrott wished to show me what is historically one of the most interesting Methodist sights in Cork. Behind the cathedral stands the flat-topped tomb of Richard Boardman, who volunteered to go to America with Joseph Pilmoor in 1769, the first Methodist missionaries to the United States.

In 1782 Richard Boardman was appointed to Cork, and was only here for eleven days when he was taken ill, and died after a few days' illness. He was interred in the burial place of Mr. George Horne, one of the most remarkable of the early Methodists in Cork. Mr. Wesley composed the following epitaph for his tombstone, but for some unknown reason it was laid aside for another, said to have been composed by a Cork hairdresser:

"With zeal for God, with love of souls inspired;
Nor awed by dangers, nor by labor tired,
Boardman in distant lands proclaims the Word
To multitudes, and turns them to the Lord.
But soon the bloody waste of war he mourns,
And loyal from rebellious seat returns.
Not yet at home—on angels' wings he flies,
And in a moment reaches Paradise!"

The following inscription appears on the tombstone, which is a little to the east of the present Saint Patrick Fin Barr's Cathedral:

"Richard Boardman. Departed this life October 4, 1782. *Ætatis* 44.
Beneath this stone the dust of Boardman lies;
His precious soul has soared above the skies.
With eloquence divine he preached the Word
To multitudes, and turned them to the Lord.
His bright example strengthened what he taught,
And devils trembled while for Christ he fought.
With truly Christian zeal he nations fired,
And all who knew him mourned when he expired."

It would appear that the stone would have been removed when the new cathedral was built, in 1870, but it is just outside the eastern boundary.

The Minutes of Conference for 1783 give John Wesley's estimate of his first preacher to enter New England:

Richard Boardman, a pious, good-natured, sensible man, greatly beloved of all that knew him. He was one of the two first that freely offered themselves to the services of our brethren in America. He died of an apoplectic fit, and preached the night before his death. It seems he might have been eminently useful; but good is the will of the Lord.

We have very recently found a facsimile letter of John Wesley, dated Bradford, September 9, 1777. In it he describes the character of Mr. Boardman. The following is the letter. The "my Lady" in this letter refers to Lady Huntingdon and her preachers—the "Calvinistic Methodists":

Bradford
Sept. 9. 1877

My Dear Brethren

It is certainly our Preachers have a right to preach our Doctrines, as my Lady's have to preach theirs. None can blame us for this. But I blame all, even us spread the truth, otherwise than in love. Hearts of Spirit, & Fortitude of Language, are never to be commended. It is only in weakness that we are to instruct those that oppose themselves. But we are not allowed upon any account whatever, to return evil for evil, or railing for railing.

I have desired Mr Boardman, to be in Dublin, as soon as possible. I believe, you know, his spirit is a leaving, peaceable man. Meanwhile may our patience perfect your souls. I am.

My Dear Brethren

Your Affectionate Brother

John Wesley

To

Mr Alex Clark

In Characery Lane

Dublin

W. H. Meredith,

ART. VIII.—HUGH PRICE HUGHES : EVANGELIST

A NEW species of evangelism is happily here and there in vogue in our time: well equipped in scholarship, broad and generous in its spirit and fraternal alliances, void of cant, modern in method, abreast of the age in its discernment of the needs and perils not only of individual sinners but of society and of great municipal communities, wise in its discernment of the difference between the letter and the spirit, the superficial and the fundamental, in its treatment of the Scriptures, but loyal in utmost degree to our divine Lord; dealing out no indiscriminating denunciations, apt and skillful in securing the gifts of the rich, and yet faithful in rebuking covetousness and mammonism in high places and low; alive to the sorrows, the degradation, the vices, and the perils of the lapsed masses, overflowing with the compassion which filled the heart of the Master when he looked out on the multitude and yearned over them as sheep that had no shepherd; heroic in its spirit of sacrifice and self-abnegation and in its sympathetic touch with the missionary organizations which form such a vital and characteristic part of the higher life of our time, and eager to win conquests worthy of the King; ingenious in its efforts to devise and utilize fresh agencies for catching the attention, arousing the conscience, and winning the hearts of the unconverted; and, indeed, bent on one all-absorbing aim—to win lost men and women to the service of Jesus Christ!

Of such evangelism Saint Paul still remains the ancient and all-enduring type; John Wesley furnishes without a doubt the best representation of it that the ages have developed since the days of the great apostle; while in some fair measure the late Rev. Dr. J. O. Peck and Mr. Dwight L. Moody, Rev. Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman, Rev. W. J. Dawson—the work of the last named having really bourgeoned out in this country, although he belongs, as our readers will recall, in London—and Mr. John R. Mott may be taken as recent embodiments of the more salient elements of it on this side of the Atlantic. But in our day, after all, only one man has appeared on either side of the sea who may be fairly con-

sidered as summing up in his own spirit, personality, and ministry nearly all the notable aspects of the evangelistic movement which we have just outlined and analyzed, and that man is Hugh Price Hughes, the great Wesleyan leader, who, in November, 1902, like Alfred Cookman—to cite the tribute of Punshon, spoken more than thirty years ago, “was stricken into immortality in his prime”—leaving an example, an influence, and a forward impetus to the churches of Great Britain which cannot easily be overstressed. This notable man is brought before the world afresh in his *Life*,¹ written by his daughter, a young woman of twenty-two years—an elaborate biography which allures us to a new study of the man and his work in view of the illumination, gathered from many quarters, which it focuses upon his manifold personality and his far-reaching enterprises and toils.

Two brief tributes may be cited in support—were any needed—of the judgment just expressed. We recently heard Rev. Dr. Herbert Welch, president-elect of Ohio Wesleyan University, declare in a most impressive address, in which he summed up the results of months of personal study given to city evangelization work in Great Britain, particularly that form of it which Mr. Hughes had projected and carried on for fifteen years in the latter part of his life: “Hugh Price Hughes I consider one of the three great Methodists in the history of the movement of which John Wesley was the peerless leader.” Dr. Welch did not indicate the third one in his trio—Charles Wesley, or Thomas Coke, or Francis Asbury? He had no question, however, of the right of Mr. Hughes to a place in this inner circle, in view of the scope and the depth of the many-sided work done by him in England. One other citation of like character must suffice. We take it from a declaration made by Rev. Dr. Henry J. Pope, one of the Wesleyan leaders of to-day, who was intimately associated with Mr. Hughes for a score of years:

His life and work have marked an epoch in the progress of Methodism. His influence will be a tradition that cannot die. Others will feel its power and its spell for many years to come. The chapter in our history he has opened will not be closed by his removal, and in the years to come he will be seen to be

¹ *The Life of Hugh Price Hughes*. By His Daughter, Dorothea Price Hughes. With Photogravure Portrait. 8vo, pp. 679. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, \$3 net.

greater even than most of his contemporaries have felt him to be. Much as we should have liked to keep him, we cannot fail to see that the vigor, intensity, and enthusiasm that have prematurely worn him out have helped him to accomplish in the years spent on earth vastly more than most men can hope to do with the longest life.¹

"But," some may query, "is the term 'Evangelist' the final word which describes him? Does it fittingly define his manifold ministry? Was he not something more and greater and more influential than any evangelist can be?"

The question deserves brief consideration. It may be conceded in response to any possible contention in the case that Hugh Price Hughes was a debater of singular ardor and skill; a reformer whose energetic hand helped forward most of the recent movements which differentiate the Wesleyanism of to-day from that of yesterday; a politician, in the right sense of the term, who was in league with British statesmen like Gladstone and Rosebery in the endeavor to extend the right of suffrage and to further other great democratic reforms; an eager advocate of the parliamentary franchise and other privileges for women; a leader in the temperance movement; an official of the Peace Society, and yet a sturdy advocate of British imperialism and a devout believer in the righteousness of the South African War; recognized by his brethren as *facile princeps* in the organization and work of the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, the first presidency of which organization he occupied with honor in 1896; a pastor of ability and devotion; and an editor whose pen was acknowledged as a distinctive force in English denominational journalism. All this may be candidly allowed, and still the judgment will, we opine, hold good that in all these varied vocations, from the opening to the close of his sturdy and shining ministry, he was an evangelist. His aim was evangelism—pastoral evangelism, city evangelism, national evangelism, world-wide evangelism. The noble visions and glorious purposes involved in the term aroused his entire being and absorbed all his powers; and to this cause, accordingly, he gave without stint and without swerving the full measure of life-long devotion.

It should be found worth while for us on this side of the water,

¹ Life, p. 541.

therefore, to study such a life, and to take heed concerning such a type of the Pauline evangelism, reproduced and modernized—an evangelism which allies itself with scholarship and is in league with the college and the theological school; which is sane and reverent in its manner and in its religious utterances; which binds together knowledge with fervor, thus blending into a sacred harmony apostolic zeal with the aims and attainments of the university; which consecrates the noblest intellectual and spiritual gifts to the service of the least and the lowliest of the poor; and which imitates the Master, who not only wept over the sins and the sorrows of the city, but was willing to give his life to redeem it! Of such an evangelism Hugh Price Hughes was a great modern exponent.

It goes without saying that it was an ambitious, an audacious, and a risky venture for a young woman of twenty-two to attempt to write the life of such a man—her father. As might be anticipated, she has not steered clear of the pitfalls spread for unwary feet venturing into the realms of biographical authorship; there are defects in the book which if eliminated would greatly strengthen her work. But as a whole the task has been achieved with an ability, a tact, and a fidelity which are literally phenomenal. Some of the mannerisms of the book, however, should have been rejected on capable editorial advice, such as the use of the term *Fidus Achates*, hundreds of times, to indicate the typical follower of Mr. Hughes in his gladiatorial and other conflicts; the undue prolixity of the story occasioned by needlessly diffuse expositions, comments, and philosophizings and continuous efforts to set forth the inner workings of the mind and will of Mr. Hughes in all manner of critical situations. The daughter is not daunted by any difficulty, lights up foggy situations with womanly insight, and fluently writes of the purposes, thoughts, fancies, motives, and internal questionings of her father, as though she had seen his intellectual economy illuminated from time to time by something like an electric bulb. And yet, after all due criticism has been fairly made, it is a singularly apt, interesting, and able book that Miss Hughes has written. She goes through all the political, ecclesiastical, reformatory, combative, and complicated situations and

turmoils of her father's life; writes of them like an expert; solves the mysteries still clinging to them as though she had been "on the inside"; and altogether contrives to give the reader a remarkably clear, full, and ample revelation of the environment, the aims, the secret struggles, the hidden hopes, and, we might almost say, the esoteric excogitations involved in the career which she unfolds, from start to finish. She seems almost to have adopted the gospel maxim as her motto, "There is nothing hid which shall not be made known." But throughout, although she has to deal with many a period of storm and stress, she is seemingly fair and even generous to those of the "other side."

A glance at the parentage, the childhood environment, and the educational equipment of this man will suggest what he owed to these shaping factors in his career. He was born in Wales, of a stock running back hundreds of years and in some of its ancient branches allying itself with royalty. And he showed in many ways that he was a Welshman! That race is opinionated, fond of music, combative, conscious of its superiority to the English, fervid beyond measure, stubborn in its convictions, heroic in its leadership! And as to preachers—who can enumerate the noble types which Wales has produced? Young Hughes's grandfather was a Wesleyan preacher, a man of singular evangelistic gifts and of great courage; he married a Miss Price, a woman of aristocratic lineage and proclivities, and of strong character. Young Hughes's father was a physician of Carmarthen, Wales, perhaps the noblest-looking, most commanding and honored personage in the community; the mother was a devout, brilliant, and vital woman, a Jewess, whose grandfather had been converted to Christianity. Her intellect was wonderful for its clear, penetrating powers of insight, and for its quickness of action. With such a parentage, and with such ancestral strains mingling in his veins, it is no wonder that the lad showed early in his boyhood signs of unusual powers.

He was converted at the age of thirteen, while attending a boarding school at Swansea. One Sabbath day a company of devout fishermen attended service at the school, and one by one they were summoned to prayer. Their prayers were such as the

boy had never heard—something like the supplications which stirred Francis Asbury's boy-heart and led him to surrender to Christ. Young as this Welsh boy was, he passed through much travail of soul and deep conviction, and finally reached a point of conscious and earnest surrender to the Lord. It was only a year or two later when he was called on to begin in a sort of way his lifework of preaching the gospel. And so manifest were the signs of mental and spiritual promise in him that even thus early the prophecy began to be whispered around, "That boy is destined to do a great and a good work in the world. If he lives he will surely reach the topmost place in Wesleyanism, the presidency of the Conference." When the divine call was clearly apprehended by him he wrote to his father this laconic but significant note:

MY DEAR FATHER: I believe it is the will of God that I should be a Methodist preacher. Your affectionate son,
HUGH.

The mother, when the note came, broke into a fit of irresistible weeping—tears of ineffable rapture, for her prayers were answered—her boy was to preach the gospel! The father wrote back this brief but suggestive line:

MY DEAR SON: I would rather you were a Wesleyan preacher than Lord Chancellor of England.

The inspiration of such a spirit of devotion, of consecration, and of holy zeal on the part of the parents remained upon this promising son not only in the years of his ministerial apprenticeship, but they formed a part of the elemental forces which shaped and crowned his life.

Young Hughes was born in 1847; the years from 1865 to 1869 were spent at Richmond College, near London. On his entrance examination he stood second in a class of one hundred and forty-six. He maintained a foremost rank at college as he had done in the preparatory school, and in 1869 he finished his course and also took his degree of B.A. in the University of London. At Richmond his reverential admiration for Dr. Moulton, the great scholar of that time in Wesleyanism, and the affection which sprang up between himself and the daughter of the head of

the school, Miss Mary Katherine Barrett, whom he happily married some years later, were matters that had a vital relation to his after career. His first appointment was the old city of Dover, where Methodism had been dormant for years. Under the new pastor's first sermon a shock like that of lightning from heaven swept through the congregation: eighteen souls presented themselves for prayer in answer to the appeal of the lithe, keen, eager, and heroic young Wesleyan preacher, who had not lost any of his fervor at school, and who, as we have already hinted, believed that unction, awakening power, and prophetic zeal should accompany, rather than be severed from, scholarly training. During his ministry here he showed himself the foe of that form of conservatism which is set in the world, as it fancies, for the defense of things as they used to be; the reforms in the temperance cause and the Young Men's Christian Association, and in various fields which he projected, were typical of others which he led on in later years. At Brighton the environment did not encourage a revival spirit; and at Tottenham, a London suburb, Hughes's style of preaching for the time was influenced and tintured by the studies in economics and history and philosophy which he was carrying on in view of his prospective degree of M.A. Still he carried on "missions" in destitute neighborhoods, and sent out at one time thirty helpers to call everywhere and invite people to attend the revival services. He was also coming to be known throughout England as a preacher with remarkable gifts for evangelistic work, and was called upon frequently to help his brethren in their special services. In this work he did not aim at stirring the emotions; he had no patience with unintelligent disorder in a religious service; his appeals were made to the reason, the conscience, the heart, while he usually kept himself in full self-poise. And under his clear, simple, pointed preaching great numbers were converted.

The pastoral term which he filled at Oxford, as superintendent of the circuit, was a landmark in his career. He had come to see and feel that Wesleyanism was restricted by its rigid three-year itinerant rule; that it was not adapting itself to the changed conditions and the social needs of the time; and that it was losing some of its most valuable material in the laity and the ministry on these

grounds. In 1871, ten years before his work in the university town began, Parliament had opened the way for Nonconformists as well as Anglicans, without distinction of race or creed, to enjoy the educational privileges of the great universities. Accordingly, hosts of young Methodists were in Oxford, and to their needs Mr. Hughes turned his immediate attention, forming a Wesleyan Guild, and seeking in all ways possible "to greet and grip" the students who belonged to his fold. He organized revival services to advantage in a community where for years it had been thought that "Methodism was dead," and, moreover, developed remarkable gifts for making financial appeals. Rev. William Arthur, known all over the world by his Tongue of Fire, visited Oxford during Mr. Hughes's stay there and reported in the *Methodist Recorder* what had been done, and the church at large began to realize that this enthusiastic, Celtic, enterprising, restless man was making things go. He was invited to London to preach the annual sermon before the Wesleyan Missionary Society, and there he appealed so vigorously and persuasively for the immediate payment of the debt of forty thousand dollars that amid great rejoicing the work was done instantaneously. Meanwhile he was at work again as a "missioner," or evangelist, as we say in this country, in various cities and large towns in Great Britain.

Soon after removing to one of the suburban circuits of London, in 1884, Mr. Hughes, after long pondering, started the *Methodist Times* as "a journal written by young Methodists for young Methodists." The importance of the work thus undertaken, and carried on by him through a stormy period of seventeen years, cannot well be exaggerated. That paper became the organ of the "Forward Movement" in British Wesleyanism—which meant the introduction of laymen into more vital relations to the governing body than they had ever enjoyed, the extension of the pastoral term, the elimination of effete ecclesiastical methods, the enrichment of the service wherever choral additions and a stately ritual seemed to be needed, the organization of popular movements for reaching the masses in the great cities, the introduction of modern methods for conducting revival services, the recognition of the intimate union which ought to bind together

good literature, high culture, social refinement, and the deepest religious devotion—in brief, the adaptation of Wesleyan Methodism, with its old-time fervor and heroic models, but with renewed intelligence and with modernized ways of procedure, to the current social, moral, and religious needs of England. There were many others, in the laity and among the ministers, who saw the needs of the hour, but Hugh Price Hughes was easily their leader. He was the prophet who discerned what Wesleyanism needed, and through many a day of opposition, misunderstanding, prejudice, and ecclesiastical bickering he pressed the battle until victory was gained. The Methodist Times was not only a distinctively religious, moral, social, and intellectual force in Great Britain under Mr. Hughes's editorship; it was also a political organ, dealing boldly and lucidly with most of the problems of cabinet-craft, legislation, franchise, finance, and international relationships, which from time to time agitated the British nation. That phase of the English religious journal, because of the peculiar relations between church and state existing in England, differentiates the denominational organs of that country from similar papers here.

As a writer of the weekly leading editorial, and as the author of the weekly notes on current events, Mr. Hughes had a style of his own. He wrote with "a hot heart" and a rapid pen; he saw the immediate incident or event or prospective problem with his magnifying glasses on; each event was a crisis, each question that presented was a vital one, and hence the paper was often lacking in its perspective. But it was a tremendous power for good, its evangelistic tone, contents, and life, and its literary qualities making it a journal of vast and profound religious ministrations. Without the help which this paper afforded Mr. Hughes could hardly have become in 1887 the founder of the West London Mission. He had for years been listening with an almost broken heart to the "bitter cry of outcast London"; he long had felt that Methodism was doing nothing worth while for the lapsed masses in the slums, and for other great bodies of neglected folk; he had felt that there was a vast field for woman's work, for a new "sisterhood" of mercy in London, wholly unoccupied. There were unique difficulties in the way, pertaining to the situation in the vast seeth-

ing metropolis; and there were serious questionings on the part of the Conservatives whether this Radical of the Radicals was fit for the post of leader in such a movement. But he undertook it, yoked to his fellowship Mark Guy Pearse, Mr. Nix, and other helpers, formed a sisterhood, in which Mrs. Hughes became a foremost leader, organized an orchestra, a band, and a chorus choir, advertised the work, established vast schemes of visitation, with Saint James's Hall, in Piccadilly, as the center, and wrought out not only for London, but for the world's great cities for all time, certain exigent problems in evangelistic strategy and method. Out of that movement has come the recent purchase of a magnificent property near Westminster Abbey, on which is to be erected the most elaborate, complete, and denominational headquarters and extensive city mission plant in the whole world. And to Hugh Price Hughes, more than to any other individual, is due that consummation. Indeed, our age has had nothing finer in recent years on the globe to show in the shape of Christlike service than the sight of this Wesleyan scholar, writer, editor, student, university graduate, preaching year after year his simple, spontaneous, heart-searching evangelistic sermons in Saint James's Hall in the heart of southwest London. The tribute paid to him by his fellow workers, "Nothing was as near to his heart as this, bringing individual men to Christ," might well have been inscribed on his tombstone along with the epitaph which he himself chose, "Thou, O Christ, art all I want."

This man was of manifold activity. He helped to found that great organization, The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches; he aided to formulate that monumental little work, "A Catechism," for that organization; he gave a year of strenuous toil as president of the Wesleyan Conference, his election meaning that a new and quickening and modernizing force was revolutionizing the very heart of British Methodism; he urged and pleaded with all his soul for Methodist unification in Great Britain; but when his whole career is viewed in all its phases we believe that he will be remembered and honored more for one single aspect of his service than for any other: he lived to impress on Wesleyan Methodism, and through it on the Methodist world at large, the prin-

ciple that it is possible to deepen the spirituality of the church, to intensify its aggressive power, to link it with new bonds to the outcast and the poor, to enrich and broaden its ministrations to men and women of station, thoughtfulness, and culture, to hold fast to the rising generation, to strengthen and uphold its institutions of learning, elevate the educational standards of the ministry, to hold on to the essential truths of Christian doctrine and life while facing confidently and hopefully the new truth which each age may discover for itself, and at the same time adapt the methods, messages, and ministrations of the gospel to all the varied needs of mankind in city or country, of all races and climes, over the whole world. For the spirit, the life, the sanctified enterprise, the holy ingenuity and audacity, and the great-hearted leadership of Hugh Price Hughes, Evangelist, let us be grateful forever!

Jesse Bowman Young

ART. IX.—THE POPULARITY OF BURNS'S POETRY

ROBERT BURNS represents a reaction from the weighty artificial poetry of Pope and the intellectual school to verse in which emotion accompanies thought. He restored the passionate treatment of love, lost to English poetry after the reign of good Queen Elizabeth. Wearied of philosophy and satire, of refined and classic verse, of sentimentality and stern pictures of woe, the Muse turned from the town to nature, from the drawing-room to the open fields, and was refreshed. As a pioneer in this movement Burns won a permanent place in the literature of the great English people. But his position in this respect would not alone suffice to give his verse its far-reaching popularity. Pope also has a place in the history of literature, yet the number of people who read Pope's poetry for itself and the pleasure to be derived from it are few indeed. He is read because he has given perfection of artifice to the intellectual school, but Burns is read for very different reasons and will be read for all time. What, then, explains the popularity of Burns?

In the dedication of his poems he says, "The Poetic Genius of my country found me, as the prophetic bard Elijah did Elisha—at the Plow—and threw her inspiring mantle over me. She bade me sing the loves, the joys, the rural scenes and rural pleasures of my native tongue; I tuned my wild, artless notes as she inspired." With such scenes and themes, his desire was not to please the critics, but simply to touch and win the common human heart.

"Gie me ae spark of nature's fire,
That's a' the learning I desire;
Then tho' I drudge thro' dirt and mire,
At plow or cart;
My muse, tho' hamely in attire,
May touch the heart."

And he used the simple, racy, common speech, redolent of the soil and intelligible to the people. There had been Scottish writers, but these had no Scottish culture, scarcely even English; it was almost exclusively French. For perfection in the latter Burns had

no opportunity. He was ever a toiler. What little time he had was spent in poring over the old songs. Ramsay and Ferguson were his models, and they have been lifted out of probable oblivion through their influence on our poet. The plain unembellished Scotch, the language of everyday toil and woe, was his medium of expression. He could acquire no other. The time to be devoted to a courtship of his muse was limited to the hours spent at the plow-tail, or after the day's hard toil was ended.

"Leeze me on my rhyme! it's aye a treasure,
My chief, amais't my only pleasure,
At hame, a-fiel', at wark, or leisure,
The Muse, poor hizzie!
Tho' rough an' raploch be her measure,
She's seldom lazy."

The secret of the enduring and almost universal popularity of Burns's poetry may be studied in the formal, the emotional, and the intellectual elements. And first, the formal. Burns was not so unfortunate in his medium for expression as it would at first sight seem. The simple Scotch glides into the most melodious verse. What lines possess more ease, simplicity, naturalness, and at the same time more perfect metrical structure than,

"Some books are lies frae end to end,
And some *great* lies were never penn'd;
Ev'n ministers, they hae been kenn'd,
In holy rapture,
A rousing whid at times to vend,
And nail't wi' scripture.

"But this that I am gaun to tell,
Which lately on a night befell,
Is just as true's the Deil's in hell,
Or Dublin city;
That e'er he nearer comes oursel'
's a muckle pity."

What an evident absence of all effort to embellish thought by high-sounding words! This is a pledge of sincerity. The power to produce highest effects with homely phrase is one of the surest signs of genius and power. What more homely and yet more graphic description than that of the honest Luath:

"He was a gash an' faithfu' tyke
As ever lap a sheugh or dyke.
His gawcie tail, wi' upward curl,
Hung owre his hurdies wi' a swirl."

Or, again, what more forceful than some of his adjectives: "It pat me fidgin-fain to hear't." One cannot but feel that his language when best is that which he constantly used in ordinary conversation.

Burns's favorite structure is the short line and sentence into which he throws the force and passion of all his ardent nature. We use the adjective all, for what phase of his emotions do they not express? The sly, elfish wit, the broader humor, the less kindly satire? Yes, all of these. And more, they are expressed in sweetest melody. The songs fairly sing themselves. Even the longer poems possess a liveliness born of quick production. For Burns was of all poets perhaps the most directly inspired. The poems were not revolved in the mind and slowly added to from year to year. *Tam O'Shanter* was written in a day. Burns had an instinctive sense of what words were best suited for poetry, but also of poetic structure. His melody is the more wonderful because of his apparent lack of effort.

Turn now to the emotional element. The power to appeal to the emotions is the distinctive trait of all literature, which has been called the expression of personality. Throughout Burns's work his personality is present in all its vigor and life. And you feel it. One cause of this is that he is describing experiences through which he has passed, and he does not need to look back over an appreciable period with a recollected love, for they are experiences through which he is daily passing—with open eyes. His imagination, without which it is often impossible to awaken the emotions, is of great aid. It gives him his vivid adjectives and is most active in the Scottish superstition which peoples the "muirs an' dizzy crags wi' warlocks grim an' wither'd hags" as real to him as he makes the men and women of his poems of flesh and blood to us. "Hallowe'en" is a striking example. We have the uncanny in the following, where he speaks of the deil—"snick-drawing dog"

"When twilight did my Graunie summon,
 To say her prayers, douce, honest woman!
 Aft 'yont the dyke she's heard you bummin'
 Wi' eerie drone;
 Or, rustlin', thro' the boortrees comin,
 Wi' heavy groan."

His imagination, quick, vivid, and at times even lurid, plays also on different scenes, as when "auld ruin'd castles, gray, nod to the moon," or

"The wan moon is setting behind the white wave,
 And time is setting with me, oh!"

Burns restored passion to English literature, and it was the passionate treatment of love which was most characteristic in him. "O were I on Parnassus hill," "Open the Door to Me, Oh!" "My Nannie's Awa," show his love for woman. These songs may have lacked reverence, but they lacked nothing else. His lines, "To a Mouse," "To a Mountain Daisy," and "Poor Mailie's Elegy," show a love for all that lives and has being. From this heart of hearts there went out not only rejoicing for pleasures but that which is the truest test of the genuineness of love, a sincere sympathy for sorrow and misfortune. He has found expression for every mood of man's heart. He speaks it out not for any artistic or selfish motive, but because his heart is too full to be silent. This genuineness of sympathy in Burns begets like feeling in us. We rejoice in the pleasures of the plowman; we grieve for the sorrows which an inevitable fate has brought alike to man and beast and flower; for the pathos in his poems is coextensive with his love. How many, unthinking, would have routed the field mouse from his home in the field; but to the poet

"That wee bit heap o' leaves an' stibble
 Has cost thee mony a weary nibble!
 Now thou's turned out, for a' thy trouble,
 But housê or hald,
 To thole the winter's sleety dribble
 An' cranreuch cauld!
 But, mousie, thou art no thy lane,
 In proving foresight may be vain;
 The best laid schemes o' mice an men
 Gang aft a-gley,
 An lea'e us nought but grief an' pain,
 For promised joy."

Even the fate of the daisy appeals to our sense of the pathetic:

"There in thy scanty mantle clad,
Thy snawie bosom sunward spread,
Thou lifts thy unassuming head
In humble guise;
But now the share upturns thy bed,
And low thou lies."

The deepest pathos, however, comes from his human sympathies:

"Ae fond kiss, and then we sever;
Ae farewell, alas! forever!

"Had we never loved sae kindly,
Had we never loved sae blindly,
Never met or never parted,
We had ne'er been broken-hearted."

Of humor we have from Burns just what we might have expected from a man of such a nature—whatever be his nationality—almost all the varieties save the cynical. And what a wealth of it! It crops out everywhere in every sort of kindly expression, from the broad humor to the quaint and irresistibly elfish suggestiveness so characteristic of Chaucer.

As for the intellectual element, the same strength and activity which we have seen present in his emotional nature is present in Burns's intellect. He was no feeble-minded, dreamy idler, but a man of action, blessed with practical wisdom and good common sense. Whatever the subject, his energetic mind penetrates to the heart of it, and he speaks his conclusion with mental force and fire.

It is interesting to trace the return of annals of the poor into English verse. Gray began the work, which was furthered by Crabbe in 1783, Cowper in 1785, and found its most genuine expression in Burns in 1786. Crabbe and Cowper spoke for poverty and of it, but not out of it. Hence, there could be no personal passion in their work, and failing in this, the effect of their poetry on us is merely to cause us to look on the sorrow and woe of the poor as on the sorrow and woe of a different race. Burns in spirit said, "I am a man, and all things human are kin to me." He addressed every rank and station of society, from the titled royalty to the

wayside tramp, for "an honest man's the noblest work of God." Are you rich and contented? Then if there is a spark of nature within you you are brought near the poor and struggling on the common plane of humanity. Are you poor? Then you are the more contented with your lot, for Burns has sung of the nobility of humble labor and the simple human passions. Even in the sharp contrast which the "Twa Dogs" draws between the poor and the rich Burns prefers the former, and he gives good reasons for it:

"They're no sae wretched's ane wad think,
Tho' constantly on poortith's brink;
They're sae accustom'd wi' the sight
The view o't gies them little fright.
Then chance an' fortune are sae guided,
They're ay in less or mair provided;
An' tho' fatigu'd wi' close employment,
A blink o' rest's a sweet enjoyment."

But note "the symptoms o' the great":

"But gentlemen, an' ladies warst,
Wi' ev'n down want o' wark are curst.
They loiter, lounging, lank, an' lazy,
Tho' deil haet ails them, yet uneasy:
Their days insipid, dull, an' tasteless;
Their nights unquiet, lang, an' restless."
The ladies arm-in-arm in clusters,
As great an' gracious a' as sisters;
But hear their absent thoughts o' ither,
They're a' run deils an' jads thegither.
Whyles, owre the wee bit cup an' platie,
They sip the scandal potion pretty;
Or lee-lang nights, wi' crabbit leuks,
Pore ower the devil's pictur'd beuks;
Stake on a chance a farmer's stackyard,
An' cheat like ony unhang'd blackguard.
There's some exceptions, man an' woman,
But this is Gentry's life in common."

The whole poem shows the selfishness of the rich and shows that Burns did not wish the poor to become as the rich. "Keep to your own station and learn to find pleasure and glory in it," was his sermon to his fellow poor. The carrying of these ideals into politics in a crusade against existing forms of government was an

exploit born of imprudence, and it brought Burns little favor from his political superiors and little credit from posterity. It was rather too blind a devotion to

"the glorious privilege
Of being independent."

It would indeed be a surprise if the man who was from first to last the champion of manhood, who had extolled the poor by raising their station high on the plane of humanity, and had preached the universal brotherhood so well known in the "Lines on an Interview with Lord Daer," had been lacking in a profound feeling of religion, which is most deeply rooted among the peasantry of Scotland. Ruskin has said that "supposing all circumstances otherwise the same with respect to two individuals, the one who loves nature most will always be found to have more faith in God than the other." To Burns God was the God of love and forgiveness.

"Where with intention I have erred,
No other plea I have
But, Thou art good; and goodness still
Delighteth to forgive."

His whole nature rose in revolt toward a theology which regarded God as an austere, avenging deity.

"The heart benevolent and kind
The most resembles God."

Fear, wholly absent in Burns's make-up, could never have led him to the deity. That task was left to love, the guiding star of Burns's nature. That love was human. But though the impulses of his nature constantly led him to excess, he says:

"Reader, attend! whether thy soul
Soars fancy's heights beyond the pole,
Or darkling grubs this earthly hole
In low pursuit,
Know prudent, cautious, self-control
Is wisdom's root."

The real secret of Burns's lasting popularity is not to be found in any one thing alone. Surely not in superiority of imagination,

for, though it would be difficult to compare them, Burns was not so strong in imagination as Shelley or Coleridge. Nor does it lie wholly in the melody, in which few poems are superior to Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner." But Burns appeals to and is read by persons who care little for this masterpiece of melody. There is, in addition to all things which appeal to the critic, that which appeals to mankind in general. This element, the one which most of all appeals to the masses, is the humanity, the human element in Burns. There are many people to whom nature never reveals her beauties in all their splendor, many to whom the glories of the material world, interpreted by the sympathetic and appreciative poet into most exquisite verse, seem the veriest nonsense; but if manhood and feeling are not entirely deadened by crime or sensuality there is not a man who cannot rejoice in pleasures similar to his own, sympathize with woes such as he has known, and be lifted by the idealization of the life which he is living. Burns loved nature with a deep and natural love. Nature was bound up in his poetry. But he could not sit down on a hillside and describe what he saw for the love of it alone without a thought of humanity. His natural descriptions are always the background for human figures, for love, or sorrow, or joy, or mirth. Add to this love of humanity his melody, common sense, pathos, and humor, and you have the Burns that the critics admire. But strip away all save his warm, wide, human sympathies, and there still remains that which is the most essential element of Burns's popularity with the masses, a popularity which will last through all time.

Walter B. Wilson.

ART. X.—FICTION AND FATALISM

THE reading mind controls the world. Specialists are but its pioneers, and are dependent upon it for their influence. The unthinking drift along in its wake. Writers of fiction have largest access to that reading, ruling mind. History, biography, science, philosophy have largely yielded the scepter in that reading world to romance. Like *Athene*, it is born of the public brain and then rules it. When the *Waverley Novels* first appeared, less than two generations ago, they were read with shyness. A generation later *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was read openly and universally, and even in polyglot. That cabin overturned the slaveholder's mansion. There was a pledged sale of *Eleanor*, another woman's novel, requiring paper sufficient to make a column five hundred and fifty feet high, or, laid edge to edge, it would reach one thousand miles.

When shall some *Miriam* sound the doom of rum and war as *Mrs. Stowe* did of slavery? A most effective way to teach is to appear not to do so. The novelist does not declare a doctrine, nor appear to argue: all the more are his assumptions received. The reader is like *Pat*, who took the whisky in his medicine "unknownst." Many of the ablest modern novels are saturated with fatalism. They tend to despair, and often by consequence to immorality. If we are not free—if there be no power of personal initiative, if no control over the outcome—we are doomed. Blame is out of order, and virtue the name of an impossibility. "Eat, drink; to-morrow we die." Teachers, parents, preachers, reformers, rulers, and economists are driving their efforts against a gulf stream of despair formed and forming in the thought of the readers of this type of fiction. If its assumption be true there is no "arm to save" and no Redeemer. We are not "coworkers with God"; we are things doomed.

This is no modern theory. It is old as human history. There are vague shadows of it in the finds of Egypt and Babylon, but it was clearly taught by *Sophocles*, *Plato*, and *Euripides*. The *Epicureans* said, "The gods care not; let us enjoy life." The *Stoics* said, "The gods care not; let us endure life." This infected

early Christian thought, and was taken up by Augustine and taught later by Calvin. Still later it took refuge in pantheism. Spinoza was its prophet. It declared God is all, and all is God. Human liberty is only God's act. Determinism made liberty but a cog in the universal machine. With modern materialism liberty is a brain secretion. How our enthusiasm over liberty with waving banner and song dwarfs in the presence of this secretion of gray matter! For the sake of clearness let me state the creed of fatalism. It has two articles: 1. Destiny is dead blind force and is back of all mind and spirit. 2. Human liberty is irresistibly controlled by destiny. Many of the ablest modern novels contain this creed and drag their readers helplessly over the old track of determinism, materialism, fatalism, where heroes drink, gamble, commit adultery, "platonically" and real, sigh, submit, or gloat, as Epicurean or Stoic. The outcome is a mangled faith and be-draggled morality or a stark soul corpse. This quality is more in the general trend than in details. The characters portrayed may be treated as if personally responsible, but cosmos is ruled by hopeless fatality. There is no "far-off divine event toward which the whole creation moves." All moves toward dreamless Nirvana.

Many of the greatest novelists are free from fatalism. Sir Walter Scott's creations are grotesquely, humorously human, often barbarously so, but the plot is humane. His characters fairly swarm, rulers and robbers, nobles and peasants, glorious, grotesque, gruesome, horrible, but over all is a sense of fresh air and opportunity. Thackeray introduces multitudes of people of different rank and type, many vain, silly, worthless people. His world largely is a "Vanity Fair," but he is good-natured and makes that world laugh itself out of much of its own folly. Even Pendennis was free to have been a manlier man. Charles Dickens was kindly, genial, humorous, philanthropic. He had not lain a month in his grave till a path was worn to it by the common people. They had not found him a jailer to human liberty. With Victor Hugo in such as *Les Misérables*, *Toilers of the Sea*, and the *Man who Laughs*, there is a Nemesis, but largely in external nature or in the organization of penal and civil government, but no spiritual fate. His characters are either blameworthy for their

sins or glorious in their possibilities, and when he lifts the veil from his own great soul, revealing a halo of immortal hope, we see, in spite of Javert, a Valjean rising like a giant, superior to galleys, prisons, starvation, and organized cruelty, which wears a uniform and carries a club. Every one of the great-hearted George MacDonald's fine Scotchie stories is full of hope and retrieval. As an antidote for despairing doubt, read his Paul Faber, Surgeon. "Ian Maclaren's" Bonnie Brier Bush is bright as a Scotch daisy, and more limpid and musical than Bonnie Doon. His Doctor of the Old School, free to ride, freeze, starve, die, is "aiblens" for a Scotch orthodox heaven. In Hawthorne, prince of American prose writers, there is freedom even in the atmosphere of New England orthodoxy. The *Scarlet Letter*, fateful, full of tearful foreboding, contained no unmerited doom. The actors were free, responsible, retrievable. There are widely read stories of hope and cheer and reform, which I will not name because of their lack of literary power. To those who must have tragedy, gruesome and gloomy, even Bunyan's Pilgrim escaping and singing on his way is dull.

It remained for a great gifted woman to set the pace largely backward toward ancient pagan fatalism, and therefore away from Christian liberty. In George Eliot's *Spanish Gypsy* there is heredity where one feels the inevitable and unescapable. In *Daniel Deronda* the Jew must go the way of his people, since he is a Jew. Gwendolin, the finest character in the book, has no arm to deliver, for there is no such arm. Out of the silence of the case one hears the echo of doom. *Romola* is a masterpiece of learning, accuracy, political sagacity, psychological acumen. The characters are powerfully drawn. They are satanic and angelic, with swirling masses between. There are a few gleams of humor which do not relieve the somber world, but only cast a fitful light on the dark seas toward which all move without power to change. Faith falters, courage dies, love turns to gall. Savonarola swerves, Tito is hateful, Baldisarre is a murderer, *Romola* sadder than Niobe, and no help for it all.

Two of England's greatest novelists, Mrs. Ward and Mr. Zangwill, seem to have caught George Eliot's step, not as weak

mitators, for each excels in graphic description and searching analysis, but both bind Prometheus to the rock and send on the vultures with no possible Hercules for rescue. There is no room for any Christ in such romance. In Mrs. Ward's *Helbeck*, as a critic says, there is the clash of souls driven to their own mutual undoing by the cosmic forces uncomprehended and seemingly blind. Eleanor is by many regarded as Mrs. Ward's greatest novel. The background is Italy, which the author knows and understands. She scans the papacy with large and penetrating intelligence. She reveals her personal familiarity with doubt. Her own soul seems at sea without a guide. Her sympathies go to the uncertainties of unsettled people. She seems to patronize admiringly the unsophisticated New England girl Lucy, but dooms her to marry Mephistophelian Manistee and tortures the heroine, Eleanor, with slow but early death, while heart and hope are dead before the frail body dies. It seems out of harmony for one of the house of Arnold of Rugby to be transferring to romance the sternest dogma of hyper-Calvinism, not consciously announced, but everywhere implied.

One could have hoped that Scotland's gifted son, Barrie, would be a champion of freedom. His *Sentimental Tommy* was ill-born, but an actor from the start, in that an exaggeration of the great world of childhood. He convulses you with his innocent and wonderful make-believe adventures; your admiration has many a chill foreboding for the inevitable outcome. Though his mother was a silly thing and his father a villain, you hope the author will prevent catastrophe and bring out the better possibilities of the gifted orphan. But, as a discerning reader said, "I lay down the book with the feeling that it is night." As Tommy merges into T. Sandys in the sequel you grow sad for Grizzel, but again you hope for Tommy under her glorious fidelity. Toward the last you come to despise the cad, and so does the author. It is but fitting that he should find a foolish, disgraceful end, as he hangs on a wall suspended absurdly by the collar of his overcoat. But why blame Tommy? It is in him incurable; or are we fated to censure the victims of fate, and so, in ceaseless round, the fated blame the fated for their fated deeds? Is there not another case

in James Lane Allen's *Reign of Law*? The local scenery and word painting scarcely have a superior. There is a buoyant and hopeful pulse in this creation of genius. But it is too bad to unsettle David, the splendid hero, by begging the Darwinian theory, and, on trivial absurd logomachy, to set him off hopelessly drifting to oblivion only the sadder that he is decorated by the beautiful flower of a lovely girl's faith. Fiction of this sort recalls the story of *Oedipus*: fated before his birth to kill his father and marry his mother; as a babe, pierced through the feet and sent by his father to be exposed on a mountain; handed instead by the servant to a shepherd of the king of Corinth; reared in the court, startled at the revelation of his not being son of the king; alarmed by the oracle predicting his doom; unwittingly a parricide, innocently married to his mother, the horror of it exposed by a blind seer, the blinding of himself in unmerited punishment, wandering as a beggar out of life—such seems to be the plan of many of the best modern novels. Every choice, desire, sorrow, tear of repentance, act of will gathered up into the storm which drives the victim to his fate.

Give me rather the bloom in the canyon of the Sky Pilot, or the escape of Sir Gibbie's father from a drunkard's garret, or the flight of Pilgrim from the City of Destruction.

Isaac C. Crook

ART. XI.—CHURCH FEDERATION FOR SALOON SUPPRESSION

SOCIETY is confronted with many social problems that spring from the same taproot of human nature. None of them, however, stands out with such boldness and clearness as that of the saloon. The essential social factors which enter into this problem, together with the underlying social principles involved and the method of their application, require thoughtful consideration. It is well to bear in mind that in social reform there is danger of confounding method with principle. Principle is essential and enduring, and admits of no liberty of choice. Method, on the contrary, is the mode of operation through the conscious effort of man to apply principle. The one is changeless, the other circumstantial. Whenever method is exalted to the plane of principle, then it becomes so antagonistic in its results as to subvert and oppose the very principle professedly accepted. Men who accomplish the most for social welfare stand firmly for principle, but are willing to lay aside prejudice and make concessions as to methods of action for the sake of unity and efficiency in advancing the cause espoused.

The saloon problem has an intimate connection with other reforms. This particular reform is singled out because it stands at the forefront of many social ills. However, if the methods of treatment of this reform are true to life and experience, they will be found serviceable in others. Then, again, the success of one social reform makes it easier for another to triumph. Let it be observed at the outset that the solution of the saloon problem is not to be found apart from existing social institutions and agencies, nor in something foreign to the common life of the people. The essential social agencies and means involved are already recognized in our social economy. The imperative need is that they should be better understood, systematized, and coördinated in order to secure definite results. Students of the saloon problem realize that it has many ramifications. There are so many sides to the question that no one social agency working singly and alone can settle it. In Christian democracy there are legislative, judicial, and executive

branches of government. All have their respective functions, with coördinate powers, to deal with the saloon problem. The reform to be effective should have the coöperation of all these social agencies. Appeal to the Legislature for laws to restrict or prohibit the giant evil of the open saloon is too frequently met by the rebuff that no more laws will be enacted against the saloon until the existing antisaloon laws are enforced. If one turn to the executive officers, who have sworn to perform faithfully their duty, and demand the enforcement of laws regarding the saloon evil, the reply comes back that, should they rigidly enforce the same, public sentiment and the moral forces will not sustain them at the coming election. Likewise appeal to the courts of justice for redress is too often in vain. It frequently happens that when one of these branches of government does its duty another finds a way to nullify its action. The church, likewise, has signally failed to meet its responsibilities regarding this social wrong. Each social agency that has a part in grappling with the social problem is shifting the responsibility from one to another. The time has come for the antisaloon forces to help fix responsibility by adopting rational methods to coördinate the various social agencies which have to deal with the saloon problem, and to make them work and cowerk for the overthrow of the common foe.

The most important of the coördinating agencies in the solution of the problem is that of the federated churches. A united church has no equal as a generator of public opinion and for active sympathy in reform efforts. The social function of the church is to help translate the divine social ideals with social actualities. Hence there is need of a clear and comprehensive notion as to the content of the social ideal. The mental conception of what ought to be is the test of conduct and the measure of effort. The dream is the forerunner of reality. The church is awakening to a fuller consciousness that the divine social ideal eventually to be realized in this world is expressed in the prayer that God's will shall be done on earth in the same cheerful, happy manner that the angelic host do his will in heaven. The governing principles of Christianity are not only to be wrought into individual lives, but also interwoven into the whole social fabric. The evident aim of the divine social

ideal is to have the spirit of the Master interpenetrate all human activities, and become incorporated in all social institutions. Jesus calls this ideal condition of society a kingdom of righteousness. In other words, it implies that it is a kingdom of right relations among men, wherein each one shall love his neighbor as he loves himself. The thought of the kingdom is full of rich significance and embraces all that is highest, deepest, and best in human life. This glorious ideal outshines the brightest visions of the old prophets and becomes the inspiration of every Christian heart. It is the goal of all human efforts in modern days. God does not mock his people when he teaches them to pray and work for these ideal conditions. He expects his followers to maintain an optimistic attitude and to be coworkers with himself in the realization of an ideal which so worthily accords with human facts and human possibilities. The root problem before us, then, is the realization of the kingdom, and to carry out the work begun by the Master. The church is the chief agency instituted for the reconstruction of society upon the basis of divine brotherhood. The open saloon is the greatest obstruction to the incoming of this high social ideal. It casts its shadows athwart the pathway of progress of the kingdom of truth, justice, and mercy. All the interests of the liquor traffic are in direct antagonism to it. Consequently the church is committed to unalterable opposition to the saloon. This work is not something foreign to her responsibility. In fact, there is nothing more fundamental to the kingdom than the suppression of all forms of social evil. The church is a divine organism whose scope of activity embraces the whole human race. In its universal aspect it is divided into groups with varying forms of organized fellowship and multiform activities. Each separate denomination is a part of the kingdom and one of the instruments and means of its realization. The success of each particular denomination is measured by the law of service, and the mutual sacrifice of time and energy its members lay upon its altars for the larger life of the kingdom. The essential law of love should lead each individual church to exalt the cross above any particular denomination, and to sink all narrow selfish aims in its passionate love for the greater interest of the kingdom whose triumph is the first and highest consideration.

The enlargement of the view of the kingdom with its varied and comprehensive relations gives meaning and inspiration to the efforts of those working for some specific reform. Every single reform movement gains vitality and importance when thus associated with the larger moral movement looking toward the realization of the kingdom. It follows, then, that the best way to promote the divine social ideals among men is through the associated and concentrated efforts of the various churches working for some specific social reforms.

One means for securing federated action among the churches is to place the antislavery movement on broad interdenominational lines. All the various denominations, Catholics as well as Protestants, should get together for the specific aim of repressing and ultimately suppressing the use of liquor as a beverage. The work of moral and social reform is so imperative that it perforce transcends all theological lines. The Christian life is something apart from a correct intellectual and doctrinal conception of it. A common cause and a common experience are enough to awaken all to a united action for furthering human destiny. Incidentally this federated effort will enable the churches to approach greater unity from the work side than from the doctrinal side. The working basis of the church in action is, "If thy heart be as my heart give me thy hand." Despite the hindrances, churches are coming closer together. Whether this be desirable or not, the peculiar characteristics are disappearing. The churches tend to flow more and more into a common current. The misdirected energy and the economic and moral waste of division among the churches is now recognized as a short-sighted policy and is gradually giving place to some better methods. There exists among the churches to-day a community of thought and a desire for closer, active fellowship. Church unity in spirit, if not in form, is an accomplished fact. Christianity is seen more and more in a unified life. The unity is not that of an ecclesiastical organism, but one of the spirit of brotherhood which bears no label and acknowledges no boundaries. The closer Christians are drawn to the cross the closer are they linked together and the more do they manifest to the world their oneness in Christ. There is no good reason why

"the household of faith" should not manifest essential unity and enter "a league offensive and defensive with every soldier of Jesus Christ" in order to overthrow the greatest foe of the home, the church, and the state. Another basis of union demands interpartisan action on the one issue "the saloon must go." This united effort should be intensely political, but not in any sense limited to a single party. The saloon problem involves political action. However, it is a moral question that is not confined to any church or party. The safe cardinal principle to guide the church in its federated action should be to avoid affiliation with any political party as such, and to maintain an attitude of neutrality on all public questions not bearing directly on saloon suppression. A broad federated church movement is far more permanent and effective than political-partisan effort. The choice of one method precludes the other. The problem should be eliminated from partisan-political entanglements and denominational bias, and be brought within the scope of the thought, plan, and purpose of the church. Such interpartisan action is not impracticable. We are not setting forth a fanciful idea nor an untried theory. In our legislative halls throughout the country it is being demonstrated that men of all creeds and political faiths will line up on the moral issue and enact laws favorable to saloon suppression. Furthermore, it has been shown that a voting church when united is an invincible power for civic righteousness. There is a widely prevalent conviction that the Christian churches and the antisaloon forces generally should be federated with the distinctive purpose of abolishing the saloon. The problem has grown to be such a serious one that no one denomination or temperance organization can hope to settle it. It is too big for any section North, South, East, or West. It is too complex for any one church to solve. Neither the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, nor Catholic Church, however active its own denominational temperance organization may be, is able singly and alone to grapple effectively with the problem. All are inextricably involved. The responsibility does not belong especially to any particular church or organization or body of men. The problem appeals alike to all the churches and to every lover of sobriety. These are all so

many arms of power that should be wielded for advancing civic righteousness. There is no solution for the saloon problem except in harmony of sentiment, unity of purpose, and the joint action of all the churches and Christian forces concentrated at a given point to secure definite results. The situation demands interdenominational action. Without it the saloon will dominate both political and social life.

It is to be feared that some churches are betrayed into the belief that they can escape responsibility for this great social evil by relegating the antisaloon movement to their own denominational temperance organization or to some outside agency. The temperance societies within denominational lines may do excellent work in developing local public sentiment and activity against the saloon, but their range of operation is necessarily limited. They cannot in any sense discharge the work of a larger character committed to the churches in their united capacity. It requires statewide efforts to secure good local option laws whereby each community has a fighting chance against the saloon. The difficulty with many workers in reform movements is that they are narrow in their scope of thought and range of vision. When antisaloon effort does not extend beyond a particular parish or denomination it becomes a menace to the larger movement for securing results. The abolition of the saloon is either the work of the church or it is not. Inasmuch as the church is responsible for the results and these results cannot be secured except through interdenominational action, then it is high time that each church should define itself, and assume the burden of pushing the work by effective coöperation with other churches. This is legitimate church work. It is reasonable that the conscience of the church regarding the saloon should express itself in terms of Christian energy. The sense of responsibility and sovereignty in this matter cannot be delegated to someone else. The only consistent reason for any church not coöperating is that it is doing a much better work for saloon suppression than the entire federated body. Presumption of this type is incapable of measuring its own responsibility. It is futile for good men to talk earnestly against the saloon unless they are willing to engage in an effective fight for civic righteousness. The only consistent

course is for each church to make good by active coöperation the resolutions so earnestly and pathetically indorsed in their various synods, conferences, and conventions. The exigencies of the situation force the churches to federate in order to carry their opposition to the saloon to the point of effectiveness. The strength of each church is bound up in the united action of them all. The saloon exists to-day largely for the lack of determined, federated action of the churches. No individual church or denomination can maintain independent action without surrendering its associate power for accomplishing definite results against the saloon. The churches that enter such a federation in no wise surrender their identity and individuality in the warfare. The status of each church remains the same. On the other hand, each church finds its own life enriched and broadened by the larger life of the affiliated churches of which it becomes a **significant part**. One of the principal reasons why the churches have been unable to carry on a more successful warfare against social evils in many towns and cities grows out of the fact that there has been little, if any, common basis for permanent federation of churches with a directing head to accomplish practical results. Organized charity in many of our cities is demonstrating what can be done to improve the condition of the worthy poor. A similar federation of the churches to work against the powerful and rapacious liquor traffic is certain to produce satisfactory results. For example, Boston has nearly one thousand saloons which stand together as a unit financially and politically. They do everything they can by concerted action to promote their business. The two hundred and ninety-three churches in the city are all more or less interested in the suppression of the saloon; yet, because they are not sufficiently federated to work together unitedly, their moral influence against the saloon apparently does not count for much. What is true of Boston is equally true of the majority of our cities. Furthermore, many states are covered with the federated force of the saloon, while the various church bodies manifest no coherent activity to counteract their baleful influence.

It is a hopeful sign that the churches are coming to recognize the possibility of their power for concerted and coöperative action

against the saloon. Federation for social service is the modern watchword. Churches that heretofore have differentiated now discover and emphasize elements of unity. Father T. J. Coffey, of the Catholic church of Saint Louis, in an antisaloon rally of recent date expressed a growing sentiment when he said: "Let us not find fault with one another, but let us give comfort and aid in the cause whenever possible. Let us come nearer to one another, for this union alone will give us the strength needed in the great battle for souls, and Christ, and our country." Antisaloon activity has numerous inspiring instances where members of various denominations have come together to work and pray for civic righteousness in their own towns and cities and have accomplished excellent results. The combined effort promotes unity among the several churches of the community and of the nation. Through a common purpose and common activity a common chord is struck and a healthy Christian fellowship is developed that presages the triumph of the kingdom. The confederation and coöperation of the several churches testifies to the community their oneness in Christ. It arouses new activity and attracts men into Christian service. It not only helps to develop and increase personal efficiency, but likewise gives the church power for social elevation. With this new alignment of Christian forces the churches should stand in closer range to the battle line. The contest, to be triumphant, requires united and concentrated effort. Willful separation, and the withholding of influence to maintain a sustained movement against the organized saloon, means refusal to carry out the redemptive purpose of Christ and leaves the church without the essential power to overcome social evils. The federated churches, leagued together to accomplish results, are the accredited agents to strike the deathblow to the liquor traffic.

John M. Barker

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

AFTER Carlyle had published his Oliver Cromwell a friend wrote asking him about his methods of preparation, taking notes, etc., for such a work. Carlyle's reply may have interest for some of the readers of this REVIEW:

I would very gladly tell you all my methods if I had any; but really I have, as it were, none. I go into the business with all the intelligence, patience, silence, and other gifts and virtues that I have. As for plan, I find that every new business requires a new scheme of operation which amid infinite bungling unfolds itself at intervals as I get along. The great thing is, Not to stop and break down. As to the special matter of taking excerpts and making notes, I rather avoid *writing* beyond the very minimum; I mark in pencil the smallest indication that will direct me to the thing again, and on the whole try to keep the whole matter simmering in the *living* mind and memory rather than laid up in paper bundles or otherwise laid up in the inert way. For this certainly turns out to be a truth: *Only what you at last have living in your own memory is worth putting down to be printed; this alone has much chance to get into the living heart and memory of other men.* And here indeed, I believe, is the essence of all the rules I have ever been able to devise for myself. I have tried various artificial helps to remembrance—paper bags with labels, little notebooks, paper bundles, etc.; but the use of such things depends on the habits and humors of the individual. My paper bags (filled with notes and little scraps all in pencil) have often enough come to little for me; indeed, in general, when writing, I am surrounded with a rubbish of papers and notes that have come to little:—this only will come to much for any and all of us, *to keep the thing you are elaborating as much as possible actually in your own living mind*, in order that this same mind, as much awake as possible, may have a chance to make something of it.

Doubtless Carlyle here underrates the usefulness of his paper bags, notebooks, bundles of clippings, peneilings, and references. Much of that sort of accumulations may have proved unavailable, but without such preparatory gathering of ideas, facts, and suggestions his great work could not have been written. The notebook habit is of immense value. Every man whose business is to think for the purpose of writing or speaking should practice this habit incessantly; never be without a notebook in his pocket; and never let a day pass without making notes about something relating to his work. Ideas that pass through his mind should be jotted down and kept. One idea born within him, from his own thinking and feeling, is worth more to him and for his use than a hundred borrowed from books.

SHELLEY AND LATER RATIONALISTS

EVEN if it be true, as is asserted, that the poetry of Shelley, having risen to the position of a classic, is now comparatively neglected, it still remains a fact that his genius is so splendid and his verse so exquisite and his character so puzzling as to constitute a fascinating literary and moral problem. Wordsworth said of Shelley, "Doubtless he was a man of beautiful dispositions; but dispositions are one thing and character is another." Aubrey De Vere concedes that Shelley's nature abounded not only in beautiful but in noble dispositions, but thinks his character had two great defects. The first was a want of robustness, solidity, and self-possession, his emotional nature being excessive in quantity and hysterical in quality. His second and chief defect was a lack of reverence quite extraordinary in a man of such genius—for high genius is commonly as quick as mere vulgar talent is slow in recognizing the greatness of the things above us. The insolent audacity on religious subjects in some of Shelley's religious poems implies either something abnormal in his cerebral organization or else an extraordinary pride such as even Byron, with all his sins and follies, was never guilty of. De Vere inclines to the former of these explanations. He detected in Shelley something angelic, such as he never saw the slightest trace of in Byron, even in his boyhood days of Byronic enthusiasm. He says:

I never can quite make out whether Shelley was a Fallen Angel still fierce with the pride that caused that fall, or an Angel in duress struggling with sad limitations. But the angelic quality, limited or perverted as it is, is manifest to me not only in the emotional parts of his poetry but in its intellectual processes. There is a marvelous intuitive power about his intelligence, a most subtle discernment and following up of principles. His intelligence had also a keen logic, notwithstanding some critics deny him the gift of logic because his conclusions are often so wild and injudicious; this was due to the fact that he started from wild premises, and then the logical habit of his mind carried him to wild conclusions with a speed proportioned to his strength. In many things Shelley also exhibited good sense, sound practical judgment, always exercising it in behalf of his friends far more than for himself. But in connection with matters of supreme spiritual moment he flung away sound judgment and good sense by that one act of moral insanity, committed in his boyhood, by which he trampled Belief under foot. He mistook Religion for a moral tyranny, and therefore assailed it; mistook Faith for weakness, and therefore denounced it. But he could never pass out of the region of religious thoughts and things. Religion of some sort was a necessity to him, for neither material things nor human affections sufficed for him, and in worldly matters or frivolous interests he had no concern. A religion he must have, whether one strong in its divine truth or a quasi-religion shining with illusive surface-beauty though hollow at the core. As habitually as the most religious man, he mused on some

great Deliverance for the human race; but in his scheme the Deliverer was to be, not a God-man, but a Man-god, not a Redeemer descending to earth in compassionate humiliation, but a Titan fighting his way upward and hurling mountains against the heavenly seats. Prometheus Unbound is thus the Shelleyan Gospel. The victory announced by Shelley is to be that of science, and of fearless revolt against all authority, and against everything in Religion that implies veneration. All this Shelley clearly and openly proclaimed; and it was not the babble of a shallow visionary, but the challenge of the daring false prophet of song. He branded Religion as superstition and tyranny, belief as credulity and weakness, humility as cowardice and insincerity, and he left no place whatever for penitence.

De Vere asserts that the leading Rationalistic writers of our day are, without giving credit to Shelley, exploiting and amplifying his views, without a tenth part of his genius, and with such equivocal language and subtle concealments as involve a dishonesty which he would have scorned to use. These writers present us with a new Religion which is to supersede Christianity without doing it any injury, though leaving man's mind without light and his heart without hope and his life without guidance; a Religion which audaciously claims to retain the august titles of Theism and Christianity. This pretentious, all-embracing, and extremely catholic Religion includes three elements, the Religion of Nature, the Religion of Beauty, and the Religion of Humanity. Now, each of these three was announced more than eighty years ago by Shelley, and by him illustrated with a splendor which no later writer has approached. But Shelley did not attempt to pass any one of them off as a Religion, because he knew that they were not religions; but rather the actual denial and repudiation of all Religion, and the substitution for it of something which taught men to admire all things for what they were worth but admonished them to worship nothing. Shelley was far more clear-minded, candid, and honest than those persons who now affront us by claiming the name of Christian for a pseudo-religion which does not include a belief in a God (for a God, not Personal, can no more be a God than the law of gravitation is God), nor a belief in an immortal soul. By some of these disingenuous and misty minds it is contended that men can retain certain elevated and poetic emotions, after having discarded their Redeemer and their God; that mankind can obtain at a cheaper rate the imaginative excitements they have been accustomed to find comfort in, and may warm their hands sufficiently at the embers of a dying fire after the sun has been blotted out of heaven. "What matter if we take away your God?" say they. "There remains the grandeur of the Material Universe as a substitute

to wonder at with solemn awe. What matter if we abstract from the clasp of your faith a Saviour? Console yourself with the saving charms which emanate from flowers and art and poetry and benevolence." Against such shallow, thin, and petty triflers Michael Angelo, greatest of artists, writes in one of his sonnets:

"Now hath my life across a stormy sea
Like a frail bark reached that wide port where all
Are bidden, ere the final reckoning fall
Of good and evil for eternity.
Now know I well how that fond fantasy
Which made my soul the worshiper and thrall
Of earthly art is vain. . . .
Painting nor sculpture now can lull to rest
My soul that turns to His great love on high,
Whose arms, to clasp us, on the cross were spread."

Now, we have more respect for audacious and militant blasphemy than for the pseudo-Christian compromising which loses all that we hold dear and gains nothing that is worth having. We prefer Shelley's brilliant and hysterical rage to the subtle and romancing flippancy of that "elderly and erudite butterfly," Renan, or to the cheerful gypsy-ing, from one dark province to faithlessness to another, of that unfixed and wandering star, M. D. Conway. But the most important and gratifying fact for us in this whole matter is that neither Shelley nor these later rationalists have made any impression on evangelical Christianity to retard its rapidly advancing progress, curtail its extending influence, or diminish its increasing and intensifying activities. It is truer now than when written by the brilliant young insurgent who was drowned in Spezzia Bay that, "blazoned as on Heaven's eternal noon, the Cross leads generations on." And the glow of a new Christian revival is to-day wakening and warning the world.

A TYPICAL SCHOLAR'S LIFE

NEARLY forty years ago the University of Cambridge decided to establish a chair of Sanskrit. There were two candidates, a German and an Englishman. The method of the Englishman's canvass was peculiar; he went about telling everyone what an excellent scholar his competitor was. The university, nevertheless, was wise enough to elect the Englishman. His name was Cowell. So says the President of Magdalen College, Oxford, and adds that Cowell was a perfect type of the genuine scholar, vast in knowledge and grand in simplicity.

And it seems to be generally recognized that Edward Byles Cowell, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., who died two years ago at the age of seventy-seven, having been a professor in the Presidency College at Calcutta, India, for ten years, and Professor of Sanskrit at Cambridge University for thirty-three years, was, more than any other man of his generation, a typical scholar, the true savant. From the time he was seven years old his entire life was spent in the intensely eager acquisition of knowledge. When hardly in his teens the thing which most excited the cupidity of the boy as he passed and repassed a certain store window in Ipswich was a five-volume edition of Livy's Histories, old and brown. This classic masterpiece of Latin literature he coveted until the money given him on his fourteenth birthday, added to previous savings, enabled him to buy the treasure which had tempted his hungry eyes for years. When he was sixteen the death of his father forced him to leave school and go to work in a countinghouse. While there he had for study only his evenings, which he fondly called "my golden hours of candlelight." After some years he managed to get to Oxford, where, he says, he "gained plenty of useful and interesting culture, but not the Cambridge kind of scholarship; for Oxford has not got it, as Dr. Jowett shows in his Republic."

The good angel of Cowell's life was his wife, a clever woman, fourteen years his senior, of affectionate nature and strikingly attractive personality, herself a scholar with no small learning, and with boundless faith and pride in her husband. To his oldest friend she writes with enthusiasm of his extraordinary powers of application: "I never even imagined such intensity of application; he has literally to tear himself from his books at night." His rigid economy of time appears in his own words: "Only by penurious thrift over the golden dust of time's minutes can anything really great ever be done. But much can be done by a resolute will and taking advantage of every half hour."

From childhood his appetite for languages was as insatiable as his power of acquisition was enormous. The boy of eighteen wrote his school friend, George Kitchin, afterward Dean of Winchester and Durham, such things as these:

I am reading *Gil Blas* in French—what splendid fun it is! . . . I read recently two very fair books of our old friend Nonnus—the strangest compound of truly Homeric grandeur with truly idiotic Robert Montgomery-like bombast and unmeaning fine phrases. . . . I am now learning Norse. I have begun it with great spirit, and am reading *Lodbrog Guida*, or the death song of *Lodbrog* the hairy-breeches or pantaloons warrior. . . . I went to Chelsea to call

on Mr. Carlyle, and spent a delightful half hour with him. We had a *joli* talk about Norse, German, etc. He recommended me to leave old Norse and apply myself to German; but as I am mad over the Norse I shall go on with it. . . . I have seen another language I am mad to learn—the Provençal dialect, in which are written some most exquisite poems.

Not only in languages, but in mathematics and metaphysics his delight was equal to his diligence. In the same period of his youth he writes a friend: "I am now deep in Calculus, with which I am enraptured. My tutor gave me a push in Trigonometry and then started me in the Differential Calculus, and left me. At present I am cutting through it like cheese." A little later he writes: "I am immersed in a sea of metaphysics, busy with Thomas Aquinas, Sextus Empiricus the doubter, and some others of the old Fathers, and fools such as Duns Scotus."

At the age of twenty-three he writes again to George Kitchin:

I have begun your favorite Aristotle; I will finish the first book of his *Ethics* to-day. That piece about an Iliad of misfortunes being unable to destroy the well-being of the good man quite woke up my enthusiasm. I don't wonder Aristotle has been a name of power in the world; and he has exercised as much influence among Arabians as among Europeans. Aristotle and Plato will be my companions in my daily walks to Ipswich this summer. But I am afraid metaphysics and philosophy are an unsatisfactory kind of study: there is no certainty possible in them, and you can never find any opinion advanced without there being as many valid arguments to be urged *against* it as *for* it. The Germans have pursued these studies to the farthest verge, and shown that they lead no whither. They deal with words, not things, and there is no substratum of *fact* to build upon. I think that dying speech of poor Aristotle a dirge on all philosophy, "*Anxius vixi—dubius morior*," and yet this anxious and dubious mind has formed a multitude of other minds who maintain his doctrine to be *certain* and *infallible*.

Of certain Latin and Greek authors he writes at twenty-four:

Carlyle says the greatest minds are always unconscious. One sees this remarkably in Æschylus and Sophocles. They throw themselves so *absorbingly* into their characters that everything seems real and solid in their fancy-created world; we forget the artist, and everything stands out *alive*. Now, in Euripides we see his self-consciousness at work, and this prevents the noblest kind of poetry. Still, I love Euripides—his pathos goes home to the heart in the most wonderful way. Some things in his two Iphigenias will live in my memory forever. I enjoy the letters from Pliny to Tacitus, partly because the style is exquisitely polished and Pliny is one of those real gentlemen who carry dignity wherever they go, and partly because he was the bosom friend of Tacitus. Tacitus would not write his *Annals* until he had assured himself that Pliny would not do them—for he considered himself inferior to Pliny. One of the *Reviews* calls Tacitus's writings a dark picture of mankind which makes our hearts ache. We seem to find ourselves in a gloomy region in the midst of the

dark gnarled forest of our life where no ray of sunshine ever pierces the gloom, and black shading ill seems to track us on every side. How different from old Homer, in whose eyes all nature seemed to laugh pleasure and joyance in one vast ocean of delight.

For this great scholar everything has a religious aspect. He studies with his windows open toward Jerusalem. At the age of twenty-six, when deep in the study of Conic Sections, he wrote his friend Kitchin:

I have been very much interested in one of those curves at the end of that part which relates to Curves of Second Degree. I mean the Conchoid of Nicomedes and its application to the trisection of an angle. Nicomedes's fame floats down "Far as Time's wide current runs," borne securely on his curve. It seems to me very fine to discover a thing of this sort—an *eternal relation in the highest circles of pure thought*. How I envy him the pleasure of making such a discovery!

What a glorious compound it would be if we could join the Mathematician and the Poet. Perhaps the meanest Christian cottager will be this and more, when he has shuffled off this mortal coil. Here one sees the various talents of the mind so scattered—one never sees completeness; the round of faculties always breaks somewhere, the repelling $\sqrt{-1}$ comes in, when we want to trace the perfect curve; but still, I suppose, the heart's instincts are all prophecies, and as my wife says in one of her best poems,

"That which in thy restless bosom ever paints thee joys to be,
Is but the too faint foreshadowing of what thou shalt one day see."

Dr. Clarke has written a celebrated work to prove the existence of God *a priori*; we have the ideas of Infinity, Omnipotence, etc.; and as they are only attributes there must be a Substance to correspond to them. Certainly one would think the argument must hold with tenfold force to the heart's hopes and expectations. De Morgan says of Euler's expression for the sine and cosine in terms of the arc, "We cannot form a more adequate idea of an intelligence superior to that of the human race than by imagining an intelligence to which these mathematic truths should be purely elementary ones, in consequence of a sufficient rapidity of power of computation." Only fancy one day seeing—perhaps oneself *being*—all this in mathematical power joined to a more than Miltonic strength of imagination! Huber says every working bee can become a queen bee by feeding on royal jelly; and I don't doubt there are similar unknown possibilities lying beneath our present conditions.

Cowell's completest mastery was first in Persian and then in Sanskrit. Writing of the latter in the Westminster Review in 1848, he said:

India has a literature of its own, in which the Greeks are as little thought of as she is in theirs. In this ancient Sanskrit literature we have the growth of a language in all its stages of development. In the Vedas, or sacred books, we have it in all its roughness and unpolished rudeness, abounding with archaisms and irregularities, which present strange resemblances with the old tongues of Europe; in the heroic poems of a succeeding age we find it when it had undergone a little elaboration and improvement, for, as Emerson says,

"language is an edifice to which every forcible individual contributes a stone"; and in the dramatic poems and later epics we have all that extreme elaboration that precedes decline, when the weapon by dint of over-polish presents too fine an edge for daily use. There is also in the dramas a continual intermixture of Prakrit, a dialect which sprung out of Sanskrit, just as Italian and Spanish grew out of Latin—this being the language of the female characters, while Sanskrit is confined to the men. Now, all this had been going on in that very period which we are apt to think served only to ripen Greece and Rome. While Greek was passing from the Homeric dialect to the Attic of Thucydides and Plato, and thence falling into balanced antitheses and sophistries; and while Latin was slowly escaping from its Oscan nurse and shaping its sound from the *arvales fratres* to fit words to be set to the heroic music of Ermius, and passing thence to the hands of Virgil, who added to it that grace which inevitably precedes and ushers in declining vigor: while all this was passing, India was witnessing the rise and decline of as noble a Speech as either Greek or Latin, with a literature entirely her own, exemplifying in itself all those changes which scholars love to trace in the classical languages of Europe.

In the Gentleman's Magazine, in 1848, Cowell wrote concerning Jela-leddin of Balkh in Khorassan, whose great poem was the Mesnavi:

While Thomas Aquinas was twisting his syllogisms, a far greater genius was teaching a far nobler philosophy in the East, building his lessons upon no cunning logic or dexterous sophism, but on the eternal laws of the universal as enounced in the human heart, or, as Rabelais calls it, "in that other little world which is Man." . . . As life's sun set on Jela-leddin it rose on Dante, a fact not without significance. He was the last great thinker of Asia, the lineal descendant of those ancient Brahmans who thought so deeply in the old centuries, before Alexander's invasion paved a little footpath for history into the unknown recesses of Hindustan. The dawn of European civilization was breaking, while twilight was darkening over Asia, and Dante's voice, like the cry of the dervish from the minaret, woke the sleeping hum of thought and life among the nations to grow only louder and louder, we will hope, throughout the whole of Europe's long, eventful day, now counting off its momentous and resounding hours.

Incidentally his scholarship roamed through almost every field of history and literature. He gives the following account of the first translations of the Psalms into English, some fifty or sixty years before Wyclif translated the whole Bible into English (about 1370):

The Bible had been several times translated into Anglo-Saxon by King Alfred and others; but after the Conquest Anglo-Saxon gradually ceased to be understood by the people, and a new dialect, compounded of the Norman, French, and old Anglo-Saxon, had risen up and slowly grown from a patois into a language. At last about 1320 a hermit in Yorkshire (his name was something like John of Campole) determined to translate the Psalms from the Latin Vulgate into the speech "understanded by the people"; and for some time his version was very much liked and used, till Wyclif superseded it. It has never been printed. An Oxford man is now (1884) collating all the extant manuscripts, numbering thirteen, and hopes to print it. When printed it will interest students in Early English as well as students of our early versions; and the old Hermit's name will suddenly break out into notice like a star from behind a thick cloud.

A letter written from Whitby has this reference to Cædmon:

The air of these high cliffs is perfection, and the cliff on the opposite side of the harbor with the fine ruins of the old Abbey, dominating the landscape, is always a treat to the eye. The Abbey is Early English. I am so interested in it because Cædmon, the first Anglo-Saxon poet, was a monk here in the seventh or eighth century. He was quite illiterate and apparently a hopeless dunce, as he never could be made to learn his breviary, and he used to retire to the castle sheds and weep over his stupidity. One night he dreamed that an angel came to him and told him to sing of the Creation. In the morning he woke to find that he had a new unknown power struggling in his heart. He told some of his verses to his brother monks and they wondered what ailed him; they took him to the Abbot, who recognized that the verses were real poems. And Cædmon made the first and best Anglo-Saxon poetry. Milton borrowed some of his ideas from Cædmon's poem on the Fall of Man.

Cowell writes as follows of the landing of Augustine in England:

We went one day to Pegwell Bay. The north line of chalk cliffs suddenly sinks down in Pegwell Bay and does not rise again until somewhere between Deal and Walmer, leaving a gap in the high sea wall which Nature reared for England's defense. This opening in Albion's mail-armor has always tempted foreign invaders, whether it was Julius Cæsar or Saxon Hengist and Horsa, bringing war, or Augustine with his monks and Latin Christianity. I thought when I heard the *Te Deum* and the Athanasian Creed at church last Sunday—those are two distant traces of Augustine's landing among the Pagan Saxons. The Christianity which had prevailed in England previously in Roman times and which the Pagan Saxons had extirpated or driven into the mountain fastnesses of Wales was connected with the Greek Church; hence Augustine's want of sympathy with the Old British Church represented by the Welsh ecclesiastics. The *Te Deum* and the Athanasian Creed are essentially Latin and Western—the one being ascribed to Ambrose and the other to Hilary; and each is unknown to the Greek Church. We hope to go to Ebbsfleet and see the meadow still pointed out as the scene of the conference between Augustine and the Saxon King Ethelbert.

Among Cowell's intimate friends the one who most appears in the *Life and Letters* is that brilliant though spasmodic son of genius, Edward Fitzgerald, who was in literary sympathy with Cowell, but had nothing like his knowledge, application, or universal talent. He believed Cowell would come to be the greatest scholar in England. Many a time he made a night of it over Æschylus or Calderon or other classic author, with the Cowells, in their modest home at Bramford, near Ipswich, "in that happy valley whose gossip was the mill wheel, and whose visitors were the winds that ruffled the sleepy stream which turned the mill." Fitzgerald wrote to Cowell, "What scholarship I have is due to you, my master in Persian and so much besides." Cowell introduced Fitzgerald to the most remarkable of Persian poets, Omar Khayyám, and years afterward Fitzgerald made

a translation of Omar's Rubáiyát, which he called one of his "peccadilloes in verse." Far from being a literal rendering from the Persian, it is part translation and part original, part Omar and part Fitzgerald, ingeniously tessellated into a sort of Epicurean eclogue in a Persian garden. Fitzgerald sent an early copy of it to Cowell in India. Cowell, being a very religious man, was alarmed at the publication of the wickedness in the Rubáiyát; but had his own explanation of Omar's skepticism, which, he said, resembled that of Lucretius. In both, unsatisfied religious fervor had turned to asceticism and mysticism; and when these failed to give satisfaction and peace, bitterness and cynicism took their place. Omar took to railing against the religious, filled his verses with bitter satires upon the pretenders to sanctity as sensual hypocrites. The evil and folly of the charlatans and empirics he could see with a clear eye. But he saw dimly and darkly in really spiritual things. In his blindness he denied the existence of the soul's disease, or at any rate the possibility of any cure or help. In this, like Lucretius, he cut himself loose from facts; and in both of them we see unsatisfied instincts turning rancid, curdling and clouding the clear depths of the soul with atrabilious colors of misanthropy and despair. Like Cowell, Omar was a scholar—in youth a student of one of the great doctors of Islam, and all his life busy in winning knowledge of every kind. Here the likeness ceases, for Cowell, in all his large and lofty learning, kept the sweet and simple faith of childhood, only stronger and clearer as the studious years brought him greater knowledge and maturer wisdom. He could see nothing noble or sensible in epicureanism or cynicism. Indeed, nothing is more unworthy, ridiculous, and contemptible than the cynicism of the luxurious epicurean, which is what disgraces Omar Khayyám, and which filled that rich society woman who "lived and died full of bitterness and good dinners." This great scholar's reverence was humble and profound, and his trust in God was both rational and absolute. He committed all his way unto the Lord and felt that He directed his steps. He said, "We want to learn to trust in Providence as we believe in and trust the power of gravitation." The trustful spirit of his whole life is in the words now graven on his tombstone: "This God is our God forever and ever; He will be our guide even unto death."

About his friends the Brownings, Cowell writes, at various times:

We do not place Mrs. Browning as high as Dean Kitchin does—still I quite own her greatness. Some of her poems are very beautiful, and many of her

thoughts are magnificent. I liked the "Vision of Poets," "The Poet's Vow," and "The Knight's Page." But her verse is unmusical, her rhymes are often atrocious, and she is rather too rugged to please me. I fear I am too fond of the beautiful and the harmonious—I return to Virgil with ever fresh enthusiasm. . . . I cannot bear her husband's poetry [this was in 1862], which has what Dr. Johnson called the nodosities of the oak without its grandeur, the contortions of the Sibyl without the inspiration. Her poetry is on a far higher platform of Parnassus than his. . . . A Sanskrit verse says, "Two fruits of heavenly flavor grow on life's bitter poison tree—the friendship of the noble heart and thy rich clusters, Poetry!" Robert Browning's clusters are not such as one finds in Wordsworth, Gray, or Shakespeare. His poetry does not give one the quiet rest and pleasure which really beautiful verse naturally does.

Nevertheless Tennyson and Browning are said to have been his favorite contemporary poets, and he quotes Browning here and there in a way to show that he has felt his quickening power. At the Cowells' fireside Tennyson sat and smoked the short black pipe he always carried. References to him are such as these: "Last Saturday [1852] Elizabeth and Fitzgerald and I went down and dined with Tennyson and enjoyed it very much. Alfred the Great was very genial, and talked finely about many things, and altogether it was a memorable day;" [1898, after reading Tennyson's *Life*:] "I taught him a little Persian fifty years ago, but the Persian letters daunted him. There was great simplicity in his character. He was a really great man—he looked one and was one." The rustic neighbors of the Tennyson family said of them, "They'd allus books in their hands, meet them where you would." One singular thing in this great English Orientalist is that the one contemporary essayist he seems familiar with is our American Emerson. There is hardly a sign in Cowell's letters that this eminent Oxford and Cambridge scholar ever heard of Matthew Arnold, but he knows his Emerson by heart and makes frequent reference to him.

In a letter written by Tennyson's wife in 1862, just after the death of the Prince Consort, to Mrs. Cowell in India, we have this glimpse of Queen Victoria:

I cannot but hope that our prayers for the future of India are beginning to be fulfilled. If the queen's own spirit could be infused into her empire I am sure they would. I do not think anyone knew till this time of her sorrow how really great a being she is. Alfred had a private interview with her. She stood pale and motionless as a statue, and in a low sweet voice poured forth her love and grief. Alfred says there was a stately innocence about her, different from any other woman. She really does seem to know what it is to meet a friend heart to heart, spirit to spirit, and also what it is to live in spirit with God. Is not this the great lesson we have to learn in this world?

In 1863 Cowell writes from India to Dean Kitchin:

I don't regret leaving Oxford and even England itself when I see how it is distracted by theological disputes. Almost every kind of obsolete error seems to be revived. We are burrowing out old Zoroastrian, Babylonian, and Hindu dreams which have not seen the daylight for millennia—and now even the old Nile has had to give up its secret. Renan seems to me to be going back to Buddhism with his abstract godhead of *le beau, le vrai, et le devoir*. And what is Colenso but Porphyry and Celsus over again? Out here I get only faint echoes of these disputes. I have plenty to interest me in teaching those Hindus who are studying Christianity under me; and I will never regret coming to India if I can do a little good in that way. I am holding Bible classes in my own home.

In 1899, Cowell wrote the following indirect comment on Professor Jowett:

I am reading a new Life of Erasmus. It is interesting from its glimpses into the time, which was one of great importance, as it was so full of the revival of learning and the consequent Reformation movement; but Erasmus is not an interesting character. He reminds me of Dr. Jowett of Balliol College, Oxford—he had the same enthusiasm for learning coupled with the same timidity and uncertainty in religious determination. He was afraid to speak out boldly, and so trimmed his course to suit all parties as far as he could. Of course he was a feeble character beside Luther. But in his feeble way he did some good by his efforts to spread a knowledge of Greek and of the then unknown Greek Testament.

Missionaries in India testify that Professor Cowell was a missionary-hearted man. To teach Christianity in government schools not being permitted, he held Bible classes in his own home and taught the way of life to many. A Mohammedan Court Interpreter said the mere fact that Professor Cowell was a Christian made it seem probable that Christianity is true. He was such a layman as made a native Hindu gentleman say of two other laymen, Reynell Taylor and Donald McLeod, "All you need do is to send us *ferishtas* [angels] like them, and India is sure to become Christian." One of Cowell's pupils says, "I think his perennial enthusiasm and freshness were largely due to his religious character. I always felt in his company that I was in the presence of a deeply religious man." Many years after leaving India he wrote to the Babu Bhagavan C. Chatterjea, one of his early converts in Calcutta: "I was much interested in your lecture on the Atonement, and am glad it has reached a second edition. We want more and more to make Hindus see how Christ's Atonement satisfies all our needs and solves our difficulties. As I grow older I grow tired of argument, and value hymns and books of devotion more. When one feels 'with thronging duties prest' and troubled with life's sorrows and cares, it is more and more a blessing

to find rest and shelter in the promises of Christ. We want more and more to take his word as our guide and comfort, as the years run on and we draw near the end. I am nearly seventy years old now, and I should like my age to be not frosty but mellow and kindly." One of his Hindu pupils wrote from India: "You enriched me not only with much knowledge, but with far nobler things. By your example you taught me Christian virtues—patience, sacrifice, and gentleness. I saw only a little of your life, but was benefited much. The crumbs that fall from your table can save a man's life."

In a letter to his mother written from Calcutta in 1863 are the following views:

You would have been startled at a letter I wrote lately to a Babu, whom I have helped out of some Unitarian difficulties. He wanted to know the differences between Church and Dissent. I told him they belonged to the region of *Feeling*, not *Conscience*. Those who admire antiquity and system, and hold by the aristocratic part of our constitution, would always prefer the Established Church—while the lovers of progress and reform and the democratical principle would prefer Dissent. To my mind, any hymn book or Missionary history is a convincing proof that the Spirit's influence is diffused upon *each*. A dissenting hymn book cannot exclude the hymns of Keble and Bishop Ken, and we Anglicans are forced to include Watts and the Wesleys. I am very glad that I am not living in Oxford now. The movements there would not suit me at all. The reason why I dislike Stanley is that, while he has much that fascinates, it is mixed with so much that is bad. He interests by the intense light and warmth which he throws on the scenery and framework of Scripture—he makes us realize vividly its human and secular side—that which it has in common with Greek and Roman story; but it seems to me this is more than counterbalanced by the chill he throws over all that is Divine and Spiritual. His attempts to nibble at the Miracles are just a part of the same tone of mind which leads him to represent Abraham's offering up Isaac as an attempt to introduce Phœnician human sacrifices into Judaism—that is, to abolish any idea of atonement by blood from Old and New Testament. The battle has begun around the Old Testament, and it must go on; the world is in for it. I always tell my Babus, when they are perplexed about any of these difficulties, to remember Isa. 54. 17: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn." It has certainly been fulfilled hitherto. The smoke seems thick and obscures the scene just now; but wait a while and it will all clear off and pass away *as smoke*, and leave no trace behind. I am exceedingly interested in Dr. Pye Smith's *Scripture Testimony to a Messiah*. It is a first-rate book, heavy and dull perhaps, but abounding with information on many points. I am also fascinated by a book by Dr. Mill on *The Mythical Interpretation of Scripture*, lately republished to offset *Essays and Reviews*. His learning enables him to *settle* many points. I have been making a list of some of the striking protests of great men against the paganism of modern civilization. Arnold says: "The Gospel sets Christ before us as the object of our intense admiration, and this feeling is necessary to our highest perfection." Joubert says: "The surprising surprises once—the admirable is always more and more admired. That knowledge which takes away admiration is an evil knowledge." Wordsworth says: "In a life without love there can be no thought, for we have

no thought (save thoughts of pain) except so far as we have admiration." The grand remedy for the present epidemic of doubt seems to me to be personal interest in the struggle against evil; everybody who wishes to keep his spiritual intuition clear must try and *do something* to make his convictions *living*. The world, just now, is like Solon's republic—no man can continue neutral in the conflict.

In 1863 he was profoundly moved by the persecution and martyrdom of native Christians in Madagascar, and wrote:

I am reminded of the persecution of the early Christians and the martyrs of Lyons, and have a new realization of the grandeur of old Ambrose's words, "The noble army of martyrs praise Thee." It is very remarkable to witness how, as the attacks seem to thicken against the external evidences of Christianity, the internal evidences are only more and more strengthened. I was explaining this only yesterday to some intelligent Hindus. I showed them how on purely scientific grounds we are justified in placing the Martyr, who dies amid an unsympathizing crowd, among the very foremost men of the race. His position and action surpass in real glory a Shakespeare or a Newton, because it more entirely depends on moral causes and it is man's moral nature which is his true glory. We share intellect with Satan, but we share moral feelings with angels and archangels. Now in these recent martyrdoms we see how in one generation men can make a gigantic stride from the savage state to the very pinnacle of human greatness. These accounts of the eighteen Madagascar converts, four of whom were buried alive, recall Polycarp and Ridley; there is really no difference between the heroism of the converted savage and that of the educated Greek or Englishman. In the highest possible sense there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in them all. I try to impress the wonderfulness of such transformations on my Hindu friends here. The Hindu mind is agitated with many inquiries about Christianity. I had students with me nearly six hours yesterday in my home, and the whole time was occupied in reading the Bible and discussing certain doubts and difficulties. When I first came here I used to think the *moral* nature of the people dead—they seemed to have no appreciation of religion or religious truth. It is very different now. I would not be surprised if a great change took place suddenly in a large section of the educated mind. The great obstacle is caste. The Hindu who turns Christian has to undergo a martyrdom, though not of fire and sword, and this makes many hesitate and "linger shivering on the brink." I have hopes that a long letter I wrote on the Personality of the Spirit has helped to decide a Hindu pupil of mine who was wavering on the brink of Unitarianism, and that I may, with God's blessing, soon see him baptized.

This great savant, the typical Scholar of his time, so erudite that Dr. Perowne, the revered Master of Corpus Christi, Oxford, wrote that "one half the learning stored in Cowell's brains would have turned the heads of most men," found nothing in all the wide range of his encyclopedic learning to weaken in the least his Christian faith. Various lesser men have given up their faith, like poor Robert Elsmere, for very shallow reasons. Renan lost his boyhood's faith by studying the Semitic languages, which are the philological link with

the Bible. Moncure Conway got hold of the Bhagavat Geeta in Emerson's library at Concord, and was so overcome as to put it on a level with the Bible in his canon of Sacred Scriptures. In contrast with these light, slight men, driven to and fro by winds of unbelief, Professor Cowell is a shining proof that really great and exhaustive learning only strengthens faith, and especially that complete mastery of the "sacred" books of the East does not dim but rather enhances the incomparable superiority of the Holy Bible.

The marvelous combination of wisdom, strength, and prodigious intellectual powers, with gentleness, modesty, purity, and simplicity of nature, seen in Edward B. Cowell, makes him a source of joy and inspiration to all who value Christian scholarship or saintly character, and justifies our presentation of this brief sketch of a typical scholar's life. A glimpse of two of his friendships may fitly close this writing. Dean Kitchen once wrote to Cowell concerning their lifelong friendship: "Such friendships affect us powerfully and help to establish our faith in humanity. In deep and marvelous ways men's relations are intertwined even in a brief lifetime on this earth. And what mysterious relations have we with the souls of just men in the Church Triumphant and with the most Holy Spirit of God. We live not for ourselves, but for many others, and for the future and forever. May our friendship be lasting and built up in the sure faith of Jesus Christ." Similar light upon the nature of Cowell's friendships is found in letters passing between him and Max Müller in 1897. The latter wrote to Cowell: "My dear old Friend: I think both of us have followed through life Tennyson's lines,

'Not clinging to some ancient law,
Not mastered by some modern term,
Nor swift nor slow to change, but firm.'

It is delightful that our friendship has remained unbroken in spite of our differences. I cannot have much more time on earth, and I feel I have had my full share of everything. I also feel that there is no break, but rather continuity, between this world and the next—just how we need not inquire. So I shall be quite content to close my eyes and await what is beyond." In Cowell's reply we read: "We are growing old. It is a great happiness to me that our friendship has lasted so long. Our great trial in these days is to keep our childlike trust in God in spite of all the conflict of opinions around us. . . . My life is mostly past and my work done. I can only thank God for a long and happy life, and trust He will forgive all my mistakes."

THE ARENA

ANOTHER VIEW OF EMERSON

If it can be shown that the influence of Emerson upon the popular mind is to vitiate the sense of moral distinctions, that influence should be opposed with the strength and directness indicated in Francis T. Brown's article, "William James and the Philosophy of Emerson," published in the REVIEW of September-October, 1904.

It seems to me that this demoralizing influence is asserted rather than proven, yet we are willing to grant the position while we suggest that the fault may not be in Emerson but in the "popular mind." Just because "thinking is the connecting circuit between feeling and volition," the feeling being wrong and the will being weak, has thought become distorted. Because the theologian deals with wrong feelings and weak wills, and because personality furnishes the only basis for freedom of the will, he must insist upon personality, and for obvious reasons he must exaggerate the will out of its relative proportions and divorce it from the other determining factors in man's character and destiny.

That the importance of the will, in relation to the present opportunity, cannot be exaggerated is not inconsistent with the sentence quoted from Emerson: "All the sallies of his will are rounded in by the law of his being, as the inequalities of Andes and Himmaleh are insignificant in the curve of the sphere." If it is only within limits that man is free, it is still all-important that he should act within those limits. It is only the relative good that he can "hold to" and "define well" at any time, yet in its choice is wrapped up the acceptance of the absolute good, with its corresponding effect upon moral character.

Suppose we regard Emerson himself as the "regal soul" evolved from the loyally fighting Crump. Will not such a view justify both demands of the controversy? Our beloved New England poets and philosophers seem to have had little experimental knowledge of human depravity. Is it not significant that those old Puritans who fought so bravely their devils and demons produced a race of men who seemed to sing upon the conquered heights! They wrote from the victorious side of human nature, and their fathers' theology had revealed it. Of this fine fruit was Ralph Waldo Emerson.

We have Father Taylor's testimony to the fact that "Mr. Emerson was one of the sweetest creatures that God ever made." His will was so at one with the will of God that he was conscious of the flow of the divine through his soul. If this be pantheism, then the fifteenth chapter of Saint John may be termed pantheistic. That Mr. Emerson ascribed his own measure of the divine to all men seems to have been his chief mistake. That he was driven by the theology of his time to make statements that are misleading is to be deplored. Doubtless it is hard for the "popular mind" to conceive of a man so satisfied with God that his only

prayer is, "Thy will be done;" moreover, praying this continually in terms of the great cosmic order. The Bible has taught us to fear and to tremble, to believe, and to trust, and to love, but when there comes a man fearing, trembling, believing, trusting, loving continually, as in the Divine Presence, we say, "He hath a philosophy." "He has imitators in scores who omit no part of the man but his wisdom and wit," says Mr. Lowell of him in *A Fable for Critics*. So he seems to have numerous readers, "blind to the soul's style and make," who see in Emerson everything but his reverent spirit. He did not attempt to transcend Jesus except as Jesus ever and ever transcends each historical conception of himself. Christianity is an organic growth, unfolding diviner and yet diviner forms.

But it must be remembered that transcendentalism had no language. It hovered about the writings of a few men and women, it emanated from certain beautiful lives, but it awaits the finer phrase of an untainted race to become incarnate in language.

WILHELMINE WILLSON.

Colegrove, Pennsylvania.

SHALL FAITH PERISH FROM OFF THE EARTH?

In every age there is a visible breaking away of the old and outgrown branches and a putting forth of new growing twigs on the tree of human progress, and the crackling of dead limbs makes much more noise than the swelling of the new buds. Customs, theories, doctrines, methods, and habits of life obtain a hold, become rigid, and persist long after they lose their pliability and responsiveness to the needs of men. When the new growing life within does at last throw off dead form it breaks away in great masses, and for the moment it seems as if the whole structure of things is going to pieces at once. There being no equivalent substitute at hand to take the place of the discarded form, it seems as if the loss has no compensation, and there are always men who spend their lives gazing at the brush pile and declaring that there shall be no more trees. Such men see only the whitened stubble, and the autumn of every generation of men finds the pessimist who laments that things are not as they were in the spring. There are, however, great fields whose germinating seed silently sends up new and successive waves of life and growth, and while these fields bring forth their increase seedtime and harvest will continue and faith shall not perish from the earth.

1. There is an enormous mass of religious feeling and conviction that is dormant in the lives of men. In the depth of human consciousness there is a conviction that God exists and that ultimately he rules this universe. This belief rarely finds expression in form of words, but it acts as a mighty balance wheel in human affairs and sustains even the unbelieving in many a crisis of life. Silent but powerful, there is a moral law of gravitation that is infinitely greater in its ultimate results than the occasional landslide that makes much dust and noise and some damage. Outward forms have changed, but this inner consciousness of the reality of the divine is as strong to-day as ever, and if men depend less on the

outward expression of things that are seen they may also live more by the unseen and eternal.

2. Up through the channels of childhood come the streams of the living waters of faith. In every home there is a new incarnation of things divine when the parent looks with seeing eye and for the first time realizes that "of such is the kingdom of heaven." Many a woman has been untouched by every appeal of church and friend and Spirit till she beheld in the face of her babe the light of neither land nor sea, and then there welled up in her mother heart a sudden stream from the great love-fountains of eternity, and the world-old miracle was repeated once again; love divine had filled her heart and finished then a new creation there, and living faith took the place of indifference and unrest.

3. The nascent spiritual consciousness of adolescence is perpetually struggling to express itself in terms of faith, and the seething life forces must find somewhere a footing. The old men may dream dreams of better days long gone, but the young men shall see visions of greater things to come, and because they are strong their faith shall be contagious. The swelling bud becomes a vigorous limb, and, while it is different in form and direction from the broken branch, it becomes a part of the onward growth of the tree of life.

4. There are innumerable cumulative influences in life that are silent and unseen, but are nevertheless steadily building human character. The chance word spoken in season, the song overheard, the sentence from some sincere prayer, a fragment of a sermon, some remembered text of childhood, the never-to-be-forgotten prayer of a godly mother, the great pervasive atmosphere of a Christian home, be it halfway around the world, the echo of a voice that is still, the pressure of a hand that is gone, the chance clipping from a paper, the still small voice of the Comforter of men, whose province it is to remind us of the things of Christ—all these are seeds sprouting here and there in human hearts and sending up new growth to take the place of the old things that have passed away. As a result, there is always, in every place, some one who is nearly ready to step over the line and begin a new life of faith in the Son of God. He may not step over in just the old way, nor at just the old point of crossing; it may be in a new way of his own, for he is a new creature and the product of a new growth. It by no means follows that the new is inferior to the old.

If these things be true it follows that the Christian teacher is not to yearn for the old, but to keep in the current of life and grow with the new. Neither the old days nor the old forms can ever come back, and the new heaven and the new earth will be established only as a result of obedience to the new commandment. It is now obvious that periods of formality must be followed by a spiritual dearth and drought because the springs are dried up and the living waters have ceased to flow. To open the springs and make new channels for the waters and cause the earth to bring forth and bud is not the work of a moment nor a day, and it has happened that the man who has seemed to be slow and barren of results has patiently digged again the wells, and repaired

the broken channels, and some other man has followed him and with the glad notes of the harvest horn has reaped the results of the life that went before. Such opening of springs was the mission of the "voice" crying in the wilderness, and such was the ministry of Him who left as the visible results of his divine ministry a bare handful of men gazing up into an empty sky. But he opened springs of life eternal, and the widening streams of human life and faith have been watering a thirsty world ever since. "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Not unless the eternal can die, and the fountain opened in the house of David cease to flow, shall faith perish from off the earth.

Manila, Philippine Islands.

GEORGE A. MILLER.

A MUCH NEGLECTED QUESTION OF CONSCIENCE

THE operative principle in our representative government is that expressed in a maxim of law so generally accepted that it has never been seriously questioned: "Qui facit per alium facit per se" ("He that acts through another acts through himself"). Here the sovereign people direct their agents, representatives, servants, or officers by constitutional provisions. The government is administered by a political party. The party acts for the men who support it and believe in its principles. The party is the agent of the sovereign citizen who votes for it. When my party steadfastly and regularly does wrong, that wrong becomes mine, for my party is my representative and servant. Therefore my party affiliations are a matter of conscience, for my agents' deeds are mine. If my agent frames iniquity by law I am responsible. If my agent runs a saloon, so do I; and this is many fold more lamentable and true than it is funny. My agent's acts are mine. Escape from this shameful conclusion is impossible. It holds in law, in logic, and in morals. A license party is now administering the government and it wants the job as long as possible. It is the agent of multitudes of good men gone wrong. In administering the government it runs illegal saloons in Maine and Kansas, and it runs saloons in every Old Soldiers' Home where the saloon has not been ousted by the influence of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. It stores and bonds liquors in vastest quantities and skims off one dollar and ten cents from every gallon of distilled spirits. For twenty-five dollars it will give its permission to any man "of good moral character" to sell rum in any prohibition territory in the nation. This party's chief financial asset is from putting the bottle to the lips of men. It has, by deliberate and formal legislation, legalized that which without its sanction is an outlaw, and that which so soon as sanctioned becomes a steadfast criminal. It has by its patronage, protection, and consent made the hovel of rum to prosper into the palace and has turned the groggery into the gilded saloon. It has made the most destructive of modern sins respectable by legalizing it. In Vermont and New Hampshire and Maine it has corrupted what it pretended to exalt; it has hugely violated what it trivially obeyed. Its "ideal" temperance law now operating in Massachusetts has in the last

ten years caused an increase of seventy-seven per cent of drunkards committed, ninety-four per cent of drunkards recommitted, fifty-four per cent of drunkards committed between the ages of twenty-one and forty, and fifty-seven per cent in convictions for offenses against public order. Who is responsible for this? Surely we may not accuse the agent when the principal is at hand. The party is simply the agent of the men who support it. Nor can one escape these most woeful conclusions by simply saying that he did not mean or intend to do the things done by his agent, or by simply saying that he does not feel his guilt. It is a wise and just principle of law that "one intends the natural and reasonable results of his acts." The abomination of legalized vice is not to be laid at the door of my party, but at my own feet. Doubtless the party is guilty enough, but it gets its guilt from those whose agent it is.

After all is said that may be said in favor of the license system, its revenues, its restrictions and regulations, it is still a rank offense morally because it is simply a system of consent to vice. By this system good men are persuaded, year after year, to consent to the saloon when they hate it. For a fee they consent to that in politics which they oppose in the school, the home, and the church. And this matter of consent is the chief distinction between vice and virtue. Virtue may be assailed, overthrown, and outraged, but it never turns to vice until it consents. Assenting to an existing condition and consenting to it are two very distinct matters in morals. The ethics of harlotry and the ethics of the license system are identical in this, that they are both systems of consent to vice—and that too, generally, for money. License is consent. When my party licenses the saloon it consents to it, and it does so for me; for it is my agent. For years all power has been given into the hands of the license parties. They believe in and perpetuate license. They make good men partners with them in dealing out poison for revenue only. Under their rule the total consumption of wines and liquors in the United States has increased from 8.33 gallons per capita in 1877 to 16.43 gallons per capita in 1899, and yet we are solemnly assured that this increase of one hundred per cent is the only practical way to prohibition. The party press and machinery hoot and hiss at prohibition, and still they would persuade good men that this is the only way to prohibition. They even assert that all that has been done for prohibition has been done by them. Herein they forget that all our territory is by inherent right prohibition territory and that the saloon comes in only by legal enactment. The saloon is an outlaw until it is made legal by license. The natural and inherent right of every city and state to freedom from the saloon did not come by any political party, and for a political party to take credit for this inherent right is to deal in stolen goods. Prohibition is a failure, so far as it is a failure, because the laws are not honestly enforced; and indeed it is hopeless to expect a license party to enforce a prohibition law. The theory of the license party is this: "You make what laws you want, but leave enforcement to us." The license party will give "no license" with one hand—the state law—and with the other—the national law—it gives license pure and simple in the very same

territory. And then the press and the multitudes will with one voice declare that this double dealing is their ideal and that nothing better can be done. And thus it happens that the saloon is perpetuated by a union of good and bad men all enamored of a license party which daily debauches them. The church, fired by any enthusiasm, may attack the saloon as she will, but the moment the saloon finds sanctuary in politics our great American bosses rise up and say to us uncertain and feeble saints:

"Look where it stands;

Around its form we draw the awful circle of our party.

Step but a foot within this hallowed line,

And on thy head—yea, though it be a Christian's—

We'll hurl the curse of politics."

And so our wrath is bottled up lest we disturb some party feasting on its prey. We are begged to remain quiet lest some little disaster come to pass. And the church stands by with uplifted voice but down-hanging hands. Thus is she staked down alongside the saloon. When she starts after her bitterest enemy—the saloon—she finds herself lassoed and made to lie down with the saloon and wallow with it in the mire of licensed wrong. To enjoy the doubtful good of local option she is made to condone a system of national license, for license is a national evil and no local option can cure it. To be a believer in license and in prohibition at the same time is not only an attempt at bad logic but an evil thing in morals. The whole license system is the great Serbonian bog, which, if not soon abandoned, will swallow both church and state.

Boston, Massachusetts.

CHARLES A. CRANE.

"JEFFERSON'S BIBLE," OR THOMAS JEFFERSON'S LIFE AND MORALS OF JESUS

IN the METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW for January, 1859, being then a budding young lawyer, I published a résumé of the Life and Writings of Thomas Jefferson. This was written chiefly for the lack of something to do (and to flesh an untried pen), and was based mainly on Jefferson's "Complete Works, being his Autobiography, Correspondence, Reports, Messages, Addresses, and other Writings, from Original Manuscripts," in nine volumes, published by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C., not long before.

In this article, among other aspects of Mr. Jefferson, I discussed his "Religious Views," and described him as being "not an atheist," indeed, but rather a "sort of deist"—not accepting the Scriptures literally at all—and then added:

Yet he thought Jesus the most incomparable being that ever appeared on earth, greatly superior to Socrates or any other philosopher before or since; clipped from the New Testament what he believed to be passages containing his very words, pasted them on the leaves of a blank book, and named this singular synopsis the Philosophy of Jesus.

And then I quoted from Vol. VI of his said "Works," p. 518:

I have made a wee little book which I call the Philosophy of Jesus; it is a

paradigma of his doctrines, made by cutting the texts out of the book (New Testament) and arranging them in the pages of a blank book, in a certain order of time or subject. A more beautiful or precious morsel of ethics I have never seen; it is a document in proof that *I* am a *real Christian*, that is to say, a disciple of the doctrines of Jesus.

It was a query with me then, what had ever become of this singular compilation—this curious “Philosophy of Jesus”—and little did I think I should ever lay eyes upon it. I supposed, of course, it was only a great man’s passing fancy or intellectual diversion, and, like so many other theological notions, especially of young men, had long since passed into the limbo of the “crazy and the queer.” But, to my surprise and delight, it has recently been unearthed, like a Babylonian brick or Pompeian marble, and I now give the following further concerning it.

This little book, it appears, was compiled by Mr. Jefferson about 1804-07, and consisted at first of an octavo volume of forty-six pages, which he afterward enlarged into a book of eighty-two pages. He said he had taken the four gospels, and cut from them every verse recording the moral precepts of Jesus, and arranged them in a certain order of time and subject, and “although they appeared but as fragments, yet fragments of the most sublime edifice of morality which had ever been exhibited to man.” Again he wrote, in 1816: “I made (some years before), for my own satisfaction, an extract from the evangelists of the text of His morals, selecting those only whose style and spirit proved them genuine, and his own. . . . I gave it the title of ‘The Philosophy of Jesus Extracted from the Text of the Evangelists.’” He said he had selected only “the matter which is evidently His, and which is as easily distinguished as diamonds in a dunghill.” Evidently he regarded the other verses as only monkish tradition or priestly invention—however revered by others.

This first volume was the work of a few evenings only, when he lived in Washington as President of the United States, overwhelmed with official business, and was done “after getting through the evening task of reading the letters and papers of the day.” But in 1819 or 1820, when out of the Presidency and back again at Monticello, having plenty of time for fads and fancies, he expanded this first volume into another volume, of eighty-two pages, and improved it greatly. He took duplicate copies of Greek, Latin, French, and English Testaments and cut out whatever texts suited him, and pasted these in a book of blank pages in parallel columns, so as to have the whole subject readily before him. His original idea was to have the life and teachings of Jesus told in simple form “for use of the Indians,” he said, thinking this best adapted to them. But afterward he abandoned this, and made the above described book for his own “individual use.” He used the said four languages, with all of which he was familiar, in order that he might have the verses side by side for collation and comparison. In this little book he pasted a map of the ancient world and the Holy Land for ready reference when studying his Bible. He bound the whole in red morocco, and entitled it on the back in gilt letters, “The Morals of Jesus.” It made a book eight and a quarter inches high, about five inches wide, and one inch thick. The covers and

edges were tooled in gold, and it was bound by Fred. A. Mayo, Richmond, Virginia. On the title-page he wrote himself:

The
Life and Morals
of
Jesus of Nazareth,
Extracted Textually
From the Gospels
In
Greek, Latin,
French, and English.

This is the only copy he issued, and it does not seem that he ever contemplated its general publication, but made and kept it for the private edification of himself and friends.

Subsequently, in 1895, this so-called "Jefferson Bible" was found in the possession of a Miss Randolph, then living at Shadwell, Virginia (a relative of Mr. Jefferson, I surmise), and was obtained by purchase and is now the property of the United States National Museum, Washington, D. C. The two copies of the New Testament from which he extracted his selected verses were found in 1886 in the library of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, their title-page bearing date 1804. They were purchased at the sale of Mr. Jefferson's library, and are the same referred to in Jefferson's Works, Vol. VI, p. 217. What became of the Greek, Latin, and French copies I do not know.

This unique and historic little "Bible," however, was brought to the attention of the Fifty-seventh Congress (1902), and ordered published by photo-lithographic process, but was not published really until 1904.¹ The result is a handsome little volume in red morocco which is an exact reproduction of Jefferson's old and faded book, binding and all, and a real "curiosity of literature." For a copy of this I am indebted to Hon. John F. Dryden, United States Senator, New Jersey, and I desire to acknowledge his courtesy here.

The contents of this little "Jefferson's Bible" are noteworthy, but not so radical and iconoclastic as might be expected, all things considered, and on the whole exhibit good sense and excellent judgment from his viewpoint. He commences with Matt. 2, the birth of Jesus, and concludes with Matt. 27, mixed up with Luke 23 and John 19—his crucifixion and death. Of course, he excludes all miracles, and everything he regards as supernatural, but he includes the birth of Christ (without its supernatural features), the disputation with the doctors, the preaching and the beheading of John, the exquisite parables, the inimitable Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, his vindication of the Sabbath, the story of the good Samaritan, the prodigal son, the alabaster box woman, his welcome to little children, the laborers in the vineyard, the story of Zacchaeus, of Lazarus the beggar and the rich man, of Mary and Martha (but not Lazarus their brother), his ride into Jerusalem, the driving of the money changers from the temple, the marriage feast (not Cana of Galilee), the

¹ It was before Congress in 1890, but nothing resulted then.

rebuke and reproof of the Pharisees, the story of the ten virgins and the several talents, the unfaithful steward, the betrayal by Judas, the trial before Pilate, and his crucifixion and death. Of course, he omits the resurrection *in toto*, as miraculous and unthinkable. He does not follow the regular narrative in full, but eliminates and excides verses here and there, and sometimes transfers verses from one chapter to another, or even from one gospel to another, in order to secure what he regards as historical continuity, or logical accuracy, or even rhetorical beauty. He makes no note or comment whatever, but gives these wonderful sayings of Jesus pure and simple, naked and unadorned. On the whole, it must be confessed, one is deeply impressed with the reading of this "wee little book"—with the apparent conscientiousness of its author and the singular beauty and sublimity of its verses. It does indeed make "a beautiful and precious morsel of ethics," as Jefferson says; "the most sublime and benevolent code of morals which has ever been offered to man," as he claims. Socrates and Plato, Aristotle and Marcus Aurelius, Confucius and Buddha, have little to equal it, and accepting these sublime precepts, and shaping his life by them, Jefferson may be permitted to say he was "a real Christian—a disciple of Jesus," as he claims, though not in our orthodox and usually accepted sense.

Thomas Jefferson certainly lived an upright and manly life. In many respects he was the sanest man of his age and time. He was the representative Democrat of his day and generation (in the best sense of that word), and far in advance of his time, though in 1904 I think he would have voted for President Roosevelt. He wrote the greatest state paper of his own or any other age—our immortal Declaration of Independence—that made George III tremble on his throne, and will yet bring in "The parliament of man, the federation of the world," and put all kings and emperors out of business.

He was opposed to slavery, even down in old slavery-ridden Virginia, and at his death he freed his deserving slaves and made due provision for them—all honor to his humanity! And, on the whole, I incline to think he acted "up to his lights" the best he knew how, for the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. Had he lived in our day, with the full blaze of the twentieth century around him, it is to be hoped he would not have mutilated and spoiled eight good Testaments, in four different languages, in order to make an inferior one to order, but, rather, after weighing the matter further and duly counting the cost, he would have wisely concluded, with Whittier:

"We search the world for truth: we cull
The good, the pure, the beautiful
From graven stone and written scroll,
From the old flower fields of the soul;
And, weary seekers of the best,
We come back laden from our quest,
To find that all the sages said
Is in the Book our mother read!"

Trenton, New Jersey.

JAMES F. RUSLING.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB

SUGGESTIONS ABOUT BIBLE STUDY

How may a pastor attract the people of his church to biblical study and maintain in them a permanent and progressive interest in the great Book? It is a question worth asking; and the right answer would do lasting good. There is a spiritual and subjective side of Bible study which appeals to a limited class even of church members. It deals with the phenomena of the inner life—the sense of sin, the conflict of flesh and spirit, the conquest over appetite, temper, passion, selfishness, and worldliness, the witness of acceptance with God, the presence in the heart of “the fruit of the Spirit,” the “growing after” conformity to the life of Christ. There is a study of “doctrine” for which some good people have adaptation. They love to trace in the epistles the thoughts of apostles in support of some specialty of their own, and not always for controversial ends, but to conform their opinions in this particular phase of faith.

Sometimes a pastor would find a small, enthusiastic following in literary studies of special books—a department of critical biblical study much in vogue in our age. The light thrown upon a passage by a knowledge of the particular local conditions which caused the writing of it, or of the immediate circumstances of the author of it, would give to that part of Holy Writ a new significance. And he is a very sensible pastor who knows the peculiar tastes of his people and caters to them, and who is versatile and broad enough to be interested in a variety of motives which incline and impel different classes of believers and seekers for truth to search the Scriptures—an afternoon class of ladies, an occasional evening Bible class of men, short courses of lectures on the various books of the Bible and especially on the light thrown upon Scripture by modern archaeological researches and the literary and linguistic investigation of present-day specialists. An interest in such subjects would do much toward the enrichment and strengthening of the pastor himself, and would attract to him and his church the increasing number of really awakened Bible students. Thus the pastor would strengthen his church on the spiritual and on the literary and intellectual side. His Sunday sermons would attract a great many people just outside of his own communion.

When the writer of these pages took his pen in hand to write about Bible study he did not purpose at once to discuss either the subjective and spiritual or the literary and critical aspects of Bible study, but to give the experiences of a pastor many, many years ago, who made an experiment in a weekly class in the study of Bible history, biography, and geography. The class was maintained for nine or ten years, and to this day it yields good fruit.

It was not a "scholarly" but a "popular" process, attractive to children and interesting to adults. It demonstrated the fact that adults are "only children of a larger growth," and that when a woman of thirty or forty does not know a fact she is as likely to be interested in the acquisition of it as a boy or girl equally ignorant would be.

The class was held on Saturday afternoons in the lecture room of the church. It was made up of children, youth, and adults from ten to fifty years of age. All denominations were represented. The main purpose was to fix in the memory of every member an outline of the principal facts and characters of Bible history, in chronological order, make every member perfectly familiar with the geographical world in which these characters lived. All biographical careers were arranged in chronological order and so adjusted topographically that every pupil who knew the name of a Bible person could at once locate him in *time* and *place*. The maps used were large, but without a single name of city, sea, mountain, or river to indicate its location. The pupils had to associate the person with the place by the study of the outline map. They were expected to know a complete list of all Bible lands, waters, mountains, islands, towns, cities, and any member was ready to take pointer in hand and, standing before the outline map, to point promptly to every place connected with the career of any Bible character (so far as the facts could be known) from Adam to Saint John and from Mount Ararat to the island of Malta, the city of Rome, or the coasts of Spain.

The process by which the names and places were made so familiar was by the old-fashioned, and perhaps now abandoned, method of rhythmic repetition known then as "singing geography." If not scientific pedagogy it was an effective aid to memory, full of harmless humor, guaranteeing an absolutely unforgettable treasury of facts, and saved from superficiality by the most rigid personal examinations, to which every member was subjected.

To aid in this personal thoroughness and to maintain enthusiasm the class was graded. After examination in the initial course a pupil became a "Pilgrim" to Palestine and received his certificate as "Pilgrim." The second grade completed and a personal examination passed, the "Pilgrim" became a "Resident" in Palestine and was assigned to one town which he was expected to study and to represent as the class might call for information concerning it. Thus the whole land from Dan to Beersheba was occupied by "Residents," and all the members knew the towns or mountains occupied by the class and could tell where each one belonged. As the class moved forward in its study of Bible history and the personal examinations were passed the "Residents" in Palestine became "Explorers" and were assigned to Bible lands, mountains, or cities outside of Palestine. Thus Mary Smith, who was a "Pilgrim" to Palestine and then a "Resident" of Cana-in-Galilee, became "Explorer" of "Mount Ararat," perhaps, or of "Greece." Later on, as the study of the class extended and examinations were passed, the Explorers returned to Palestine and became "Dwellers in Jerusalem," and finally, when the course was completed, embracing the book from Adam to Saint John and from Eden

to Patmos, successful students became "Templars," and not a few little gold medals are to-day treasured by children and grandchildren of those who completed the full course, passed good examinations, and have prized the Bible all the more through all the years because of a pastor's fidelity and enthusiasm in teaching his people the land and the book, the history, the characters, the chronology, and the topography of the Book of books.

A few years ago a gentleman of large wealth from Chicago made the tour of the Holy Land. One day during the journey from Jerusalem to Damascus his dragoman said to him: "You have evidently been here before. You know more about the country than any American tourist I have ever conducted." "No," said the Chicago banker, "I have never been here, but in my boyhood I attended a class in ———, under the care of Rev. ———, my pastor, and there I gained the knowledge that made me an enthusiast in Bible history and Bible geography."

The methods which one pastor used so successfully in five pastorates may not be practicable for every pastor or in every place; but it is not without significance that God's revelations to humanity came through the concrete lives of real men who lived in and journeyed over regions of country and in cities and by seas and riversides that still remain and which are accounted "holy" because of the wonderful events of sacred history. And no countries are so prized to-day by tourists; and none are so crowded with associations nor so packed with corroborative facts by which the divine claims of the Book are sustained.

And is it not strange that pastors do not more generally lead their flocks into a knowledge of these regions and of the important events of history which made them sacred regions? I know that "parents ought to do it" and that "Sunday school teachers ought to do it"; but when the pastor does it the influence of it is fourfold more effective. And when *he* announces for his Sunday sermon a text or study that relates to the field of the class work he is conducting, his pulpit utterances gain added power. The semisecular character of the weekly class in Bible history and geography only increases the interest and confidence of the youth and adults he thus guides through the holy fields.

The pastor of Corydon Church turns his knowledge of Bible biography, history, and geography to good account in his church life. Instead of setting his people at work to find in themselves and in their surroundings sources of satisfaction he leads them to look into God's Word. He believes in an inner life, but he is very anxious that this inner life be genuine; from divine and not from human sources; in harmony with God's revelation and begotten by God's Spirit rather than by human arts and merely natural excitements. To be "spiritually minded" is one thing. To have one's emotional susceptibilities played upon is a very different thing. The moving of the waters may be caused by winds that blow upon them

or by the force of a perpetual fountain springing up from beneath or brought down from exhaustless reservoirs in the mountains. He tries to connect the life of his church with the divinely provided energy of truth found in the Word of God. "Never mind how you *feel*," he says to his flock. "Keep your soul full of God's truth, and bring all your energies of will to accept and to obey and to rest in that truth, and you will have reproduced in you all that is most interesting in the Word of God. You will live over again within your own souls the experiences of the patriarchs, of the Israelites, of the exiles, of the New Testament. The Psalms will be to you new unfoldings of religious conviction and longing, of faith and triumph. The more you know of the external history of the Old and New Testament times the more distinct and definite the molds into which shall be poured the molten gold of grace as you draw near to Christ and receive the power of his own Holy Spirit.

Thus Bible history and Bible geography opened up to our pastor and his people, old and young, a region of fascinating story, delightful poetry, and brilliant imagery. The modern travel records about the East from which he read to his people confirmed their faith in the Word of God. And the spiritual interpretations and illustrations and applications in prayer meeting, class meeting, and sermons led his flock into the green pastures and by still waters of a personal spiritual life.

THE MELCHIZEDEK PRIESTHOOD (CONTINUED)

In a previous paper we discussed the personality of Melchizedek. The discussion and argument of the chapter concerns the typical character of Melchizedek as represented in the brief history in Gen. 14. 18-20: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all." Also Psa. 110. 4: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." It is a form of argument unusual in our day, but must have been pertinent in the day the Epistle to the Hebrews was written. Probably the sentence which involves the comparison is found in verse 3 of the seventh chapter—"made like unto the Son of God." This does not mean that Melchizedek was made like Christ, but that Melchizedek in some form was a type of Christ; in other words, that the history of Melchizedek was in some sense a type of the priesthood of Jesus Christ. In this connection Westcott says: "The comparison is not between Christ and Melchizedek, but between Christ and the isolated portraiture of Melchizedek, and that in regard to the divine nature of the incarnate Son and not to his human nature in which he both was born and died, nor even to his official dignity. It does not, however, imply that the account in Genesis was purposely designed to convey the meaning

which is found in it, but that the history sketched by prophetic power has the meaning." Similarly C. J. Vaughan writes: "The silence of Scripture as to the parentage and ancestry of Melchizedek, as to his birth and death; the way in which he suddenly steps forth for the mysterious interview with the father of the faithful, and then retires again into profound mystery without one hint given as to the termination of either his life or his ministry—all this serves to make him, and seems to have been designed to make him, a type of One to whom such supernatural characteristics actually belong."

The first argument employed by the writer shows that Abram paid tithes to Melchizedek. He who pays tithes is regarded as inferior to the one receiving them, and Melchizedek is recorded here as having received tithes from Abram, the father of the Levitical priesthood. It was customary for the Levitical priests who were descendants of Aaron to receive tithes from their brethren. Abram represents not only himself, but also his posterity and all the Levitical priesthood, and this is in the conception of the writer the acknowledgment of the superiority of Melchizedek to the whole Levitical priesthood. It is said in the seventh verse that the less was blessed of the greater, and thus the superiority of Melchizedek is again acknowledged. There is force also in the designation of Abraham as "patriarch." In the Greek this statement is at the close of the sentence, making it emphatic. The fact that he gave tithes is used to show the superiority and greatness of Melchizedek's priesthood. The typical character ascribed by the writer to Melchizedek's history completes the argument. If Melchizedek was a type of the Christ it follows that Christ as the true High Priest was far above the Levitical priesthood. Another argument set forth for the superiority of Melchizedek's priesthood is that it is continuous and permanent. The Levitical priests were dying men (verse 8): "And here men that die receive tithes." One high priest passed away by death and another received him. The persons who were in the Levitical priesthood were constantly changing, and this in the conception of the writer of the epistle is an element of weakness. On the other hand, Melchizedek is represented as abiding—"but there is one of whom it is witnessed that he liveth." It is not a direct statement that he liveth, but it is the testimony of silence. As Delitzsch well remarks, "The actual historical Melchizedek no doubt died, but Melchizedek of the sacred narrative does not, but lives." There is nothing in the statement in Genesis or the psalm that mentions his death. In this respect Melchizedek typically represents Christ. His priesthood is not only an everlasting priesthood, but is also a continuous one. Again, representing Melchizedek's priesthood as typical of Christ's priesthood, we have another argument for its superiority. A further indication of the superiority of Melchizedek's priesthood was the manner of its appointment. The Levitical priesthood was by succession. It was hereditary.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

EXCAVATIONS AT HERCULANEUM

THE great earthquake of 63 A. D. played havoc with a large district of Campania. It was not, however, till sixteen years later that several towns of this same region were literally wiped out from the pages of history by a terrible volcanic eruption. It was August 24-26, in the year 79, that the subterranean fires of Vesuvius, supposed to have been extinct, gave vent to their fury and hurled vast masses of volcanic dust and pumice stone into the heavens, only a few minutes later to begin falling in copious showers over the beautiful cities along the Bay of Naples. This debris "mingled with torrents of rain, and flowed as a vast stream of mud down over Herculaneum." The direction of the wind likewise favored the complete destruction of this fashionable city, which for centuries has lain buried under nearly eighty feet of volcanic waste. It is believed that the level of the country around Herculaneum was raised by this eruption seventy feet. No wonder, therefore, that for many centuries the city of Hercules had ceased to be remembered.

Pompeii, though as completely destroyed as its sister city—they were only eight miles apart—was not so lost to the world; for here the average depth of the debris was less than twenty feet, thus leaving the tops and roofs of many houses above the ruin. It was but natural, therefore, that those Pompeiians who had escaped with their lives should, when the storm had subsided, return in the hope of recovering as much as possible of their buried treasures. It was thus that excavations in Pompeii were commenced immediately after the catastrophe. These, with intermissions, have been carried on throughout the ages, and have abundantly rewarded those engaged therein. Not so with Herculaneum. Its temples and theaters, its public and private edifices, were so deeply buried as to discourage even the most enterprising. This is not hard to understand when we remember that other towns of Campania presented fewer difficulties and promised a more immediate harvest. In the course of time the modern towns of Portici and Resina were built over the very site once occupied by Herculaneum, thus precluding, as it were, all ideas of further excavation. The modern archaeologist is not easily discouraged. The marvelous results of the last fifty years in his line of study and the abundant harvest which have crowned his efforts in so many ancient lands have so increased his enthusiasm that no obstacle seems too great.

It was in 1709, not accidentally, as often asserted, that excavations were commenced at Herculaneum. The honor for the small beginning then made is due to an Austrian general, Count Elbeuf, who had a shaft sunk into the ruins of the old city. As fortune would have it, this shaft connected with the rear of the stage of the theater. Few pieces of statuary of exquisite workmanship were brought to the surface. Count

Elbeuf had neither the time nor the money to prosecute the enterprise. So but little was done till 1738, when work was resumed under the direction of Charles III, king of the Two Sicilies, and again in 1866 under the patronage of Victor Emmanuel. Not one of these enterprises was entirely successful. This explains why operations have been suspended here time and again. And yet when viewed in the proper light the excavations at Herculaneum, interrupted as they have been, have, nevertheless, been of such a nature as to find many enthusiastic advocates for a more vigorous campaign. More than thirty years ago Professor Barnabei had the following to say: "The antiquities excavated at Herculaneum in the last century form a collection of the highest scientific and artistic value. There are marble statues of astonishing art and perfect preservation, of which it is sufficient to mention the two equestrian statues of the Balbi, and the so-called statue of Aristides. With the exception of a few pieces, nearly all the great bronzes of the museum [at Naples] belong to Herculaneum. It is thence that we have obtained the reposing Hermes, the drunken Silenus, the sleeping Faunus, the dancing girls, the bust called Plato's, that believed to be Seneca's, the two quoit-throwers or discoboli, and so many masterpieces more, figured by the academicians in their volumes on the bronzes. Mural paintings of extraordinary beauty were also discovered, such as those that represent Theseus after the slaughter of the Minotaur, and Chion teaching Achilles the art of playing on the lyre. Notwithstanding the recent discoveries of the stupendous paintings in the gardens of the Villa Farnesina on the banks of the Tiber, the monochromes of Herculaneum remain among our finest specimens of the exquisite taste and consummate skill displayed by the ancient artists."

In view of the fact that Herculaneum, where comparatively so little effort has been put forth by the scientific archæologist, has, nevertheless, revealed such a wealth of treasure, it is no wonder that so distinguished an authority as Professor Charles Waldstein, of the University of Cambridge, England, an American, and at one time the director of the American School at Athens, is at the head of a mighty movement for excavating Herculaneum. It was hoped till within a few days ago that his plan had been perfected. If his scheme succeeds, the work will be international, though under the immediate control of the Italian government. It was reported that Italy was fully committed to the work, which is also approved and will be financially and otherwise aided by several other countries. King Edward and Emperor William have pledged their ardent and active support; so have Presidents Roosevelt and Loubet, not to mention the rulers of other smaller lands. Some of these countries will make direct government grants, a thing not done by either Great Britain or the United States. Nevertheless, there will be many wealthy Americans and Englishmen who will lend a helping hand to so worthy an enterprise. Indeed, the purse of the Briton and American has always been opened in the interest of excavation and archæology.

It is the purpose of Professor Waldstein to excavate Herculaneum on strictly scientific principles. "Engineers now suggest that the city need

not be uncovered to the surface, which would destroy the Italian town of Resina, but that it might be opened as an underground city, lighted by electricity, making a sort of artificial Mammoth Cave, with occasional openings to the surface for fresh air, and to give display to particular villas of importance." This plan of excavating recommends itself chiefly on economical grounds. It would, moreover, prove very advantageous in the case of mural decorations and other works of art not easily transportable. The fine wall paintings, of which there must be many excellent specimens, could be left in their entirety *in situ*, and that without any exposure whatever to the elements.

All know the rich art treasures yielded up by Pompeii and less important Campanian towns. From what has been said above there is every reason to expect a much greater harvest in Herculaneum, this old Greek city with its Hellenic culture, though a favorite resort of the more cultured Romans. If, as many believe, Herculaneum had achieved greater literary glory than its sister city, then we have every reason for expecting the discovery of many a valuable library. We know that wealthy Romans of the first century of our era possessed large libraries, though few of their books have come down intact to us. It is said that Tyrannion, the noted grammarian, had no fewer than thirty thousand rolls in his library. One writer says: "It is as certain as anything can be in this world that, buried far beneath the soil, preserved from decay by the peculiar mixture of friable ash and water which overwhelmed Herculaneum, there are many splendid libraries which belonged to the Roman gentlemen who made up the Herculaneum colony." Indeed, the one villa already subjected to the examination of the archaeologist has yielded close upon two thousand rolls of papyrus. A third or more of these have been with great difficulty unrolled and deciphered. Unfortunately, almost all the papyrus discovered in this villa were confined to Epicurean philosophy, a clear proof that we have here the library of a specialist. The fact that they were all on one subject and none of them from any well known names lessens their value. Other villas will doubtless yield up their literary treasures, more valuable and varied, for certainly all the great men of Herculaneum were not Epicurean specialists. No wonder, therefore, that Professor Waldstein fully expects to find in these venerable ruins many a poem from the pen of Sappho, as well as choice pieces of literature of the great Greek writers which have not yet been discovered. It is known, for instance, that Æschylus was the author of nearly one hundred plays, though only one tenth of these have come down to us.

The editor of *Biblia* grows eloquent on the subject, as the reader may see from the following words: "Now a whole world of romance is offered, a city lost to all knowledge will be restored. It will be possible to look back into the life of the past with the same living reality as if the past were still with us. The homes of some of the greatest men of Rome will be found just as they were left when the volcano drove the owners to flight with the warning of barely an hour. It will be as if the visitor had surprised them in their houses, sauntered with them through their galleries of paintings and sculptures, and heard the dead themselves

tell their tastes and describe the manner of their lives through the medium of their most intimate surroundings."

DELITZSCH'S LAST LECTURE

PROFESSOR DELITZSCH has for several years delivered a lecture during the month of February before the German Orient Society. This year was no exception. This is one of the great events in the German capital, the more so since the emperor and other dignitaries grace the occasion with their presence. Our readers will recall the unusual stir caused by Delitzsch's deliverances two years ago. The facts are too fresh in their memories to necessitate their reiteration here. The lecture this year was delivered on February 25 before an unusually brilliant assembly, including the emperor. Delitzsch on this occasion, doubtless mindful of the advice given him two years ago by Kaiser Wilhelm, confined himself strictly to the province of the archæologist, historian, and geographer. No reference whatever was made to theological or biblical questions. As in former lectures, the stereopticon was made to render valuable service, for a large number of absolutely new views fresh from the field of discovery were exhibited. The subject of the lecture was "The Latest Discoveries in Assyria." The learned lecturer traced this ancient land to the earliest period of its history, presenting vividly the principal works and efforts of some sixty priest-kings, who labored incessantly for many centuries to make Assyria the greatest power on earth. Assyria stood high in the scale of civilization. Its power was immense, yet not so great as the classic writers of Greece would have us believe. These have given us an exaggerated estimate of Assyria's power. It is now well known that the armies of Assyria, in the days of that country's greatest prosperity, were small in contrast with those of modern Europe. Never did any Assyrian monarch have a larger number of soldiers than are now in five army corps in Germany—a corps has forty-five thousand men and twelve thousand horses. The city of Assur was quite small compared with the city of Berlin. Indeed, Assur was not a city in the modern sense of the word, but a labyrinth of lanes and alleys.

We are indebted to the ambition of the Assyrian rulers for the greater part of the history of that ancient land. These old kings delighted in enumerating their glorious deeds on tablet and cylinder, which they placed under the corner stones of their temples and palaces. These old documents, having remained in their places for millenniums, have been dug out by the modern excavator and deciphered by the Assyriologist. These introduce to us very vividly many a mighty ruler of the forgotten past. It is thus that we become acquainted with the tyrannic Asurnasirpal, "the most cruel of his dynasty, whose reign drips with blood."

The Assyrians, though very warlike, had attained a high degree of civilization. This is conclusively shown by the many exquisite specimens of fine art brought to light by the excavator. They were masters in ceramic and enamel work. The glazed tile of their palaces displays wonderful skill, which is hardly equaled by German artists of our day.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT

W. Wrede. While the vast majority of New Testament scholars now hold to the genuineness of Second Thessalonians, there is here and there one who regards it as a forgery. Wrede is among this small number. But he differs from the majority of those who regard it as spurious in that while they base their belief on the eschatological deliverances of the second chapter he bases his on the literary relationship of the Second to the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. His views have been recently published in his *Die Echtheit des Zweiten Thessalonischerbriefs untersucht* (The Genuineness of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians Investigated), published in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. Herausgegeben von Oscar von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack. Neue Folge. Neunter Band, Heft II (Texts and Researches in the History of the Early Christian Literature. Edited by Oscar von Gebhardt and Adolf Harnack. New Series. Ninth Volume, Part II). Leipzig, 1903, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Wrede places the portions of the first and second epistles which are parallel in parallel columns, thus exhibiting the large quantity of matter common to both epistles. A careful examination of these parallels shows that in the two letters there is presupposed the same situation, and that the same ideas recur in each; and that, what is even more remarkable, the most of the parallel passages occur in the same order. Wrede thinks that this proves that the author of the second epistle must have followed the first epistle; and since it seems to him impossible that Paul should have made his first epistle the basis of a second, he thinks the second must be a forgery. He finds the occasion for the forgery in a supposed excitement relative to eschatological questions, and thinks the whole letter was written for the sake of saying what is given in chapter 2. The forgery was in the name of Paul because of Paul's emphasis on eschatology, and it was addressed to the Thessalonians because in First Thessalonians Paul's eschatology was more strongly marked than in any of his other epistles. All this presupposes a body of Pauline writings already accepted, and hence a comparatively late date; and yet not later than Marcion, who knew the epistle, nor Polycarp, who apparently quotes from it. The defenders of the genuineness of the epistle cannot be satisfied with such a treatment of the subject. It would not be at all wonderful for Paul to repeat himself in his second letter. Indeed, it would be most natural for him to do so. Hearing of the excitement produced by his first letter, he would study it, if he preserved a copy, or strive to recall the contents of it, in order to see whether his words justified his readers' inferences. Filled with the subject-matter of the first, he would naturally reproduce it in the second. Then a comparison of 2. with 3. 17 seems to forbid the idea of a forgery. In the first of these passages Paul says there is nothing in what he had ever said or

written to them to warrant their alarm. There is in the passage a slight suggestion (in the words "as from us") of the possibility that Paul thought some one had palmed off on them a letter which he had not written. In his second letter he takes pains, therefore, to call attention (3. 17) to his chirography, so that they could distinguish the false from the genuine. This a forgerer would not have done. Besides, the reference to the temple indicates that it was still in existence, and hence that the letter was written prior to 70 A. D. There is not very much at stake in this matter; for, as Wrede shows, there is but little new in the second epistle. But in all investigations of this kind it is worth while to get at the truth, which seems, in this instance, to be on the side of the genuineness.

Max Reischle. In a course of vacation lectures held in Hanover he has undertaken to show the unsatisfactory character of the methods of history in the sphere of religion, and particularly of Christianity. See his *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Theology and the History of Religion). Tübingen, 1904, J. C. B. Mohr. Reischle admits that the study of religions, not excepting Christianity, demands an investigation of the connection and influence of neighboring religions, since great religious modifications and developments occur for the most part by such contact. Investigations in religious history have for their special object that subjective religion known as personal, and only secondarily such matters as rites, dogmas, and organization. Also that the question of the nature and validity of Christianity must be determined by considerations drawn from the historical and philosophical comparison with other religions. The essence of the historical religious method consists, according to Reischle, in the abandonment of specifically Christian presuppositions relative to the Bible and the religious development of mankind. His chief opposition to the method arises just here, since, if a specifically Christian theology is to be had these very presuppositions are necessary, and that, in fact, the theory of knowledge and the psychology of faith demand these presuppositions. Hence he maintains that Christian theology is provided with an entirely independent principle in its science of revelation. All this falls gratefully on the Christian sensibility. We should be glad were the matter so simple as Reischle regards it. But as a matter of fact it is far more difficult to found our faith, once we begin to ask ourselves a reason, than he regards it. It is true, as Reischle says, that the possibilities of error are great in the application of the historical method to religion. It is also true that Christian history cannot exist, any more than any other history, without the estimate of values, and that the Christian estimate of values is a fixed one in that it includes the conviction of the universal validity and truth of Christianity. But while judgments arising from or expression of faith are necessary in history, and especially in any personal religion, it is not true that this faith or conviction in any way settles questions of fact except for the individual who holds the conviction. On the contrary, any intelligent faith or con-

viction is and must be influenced by the results of historical investigation. Such faith may be temporarily influenced unfavorably to Christianity by the results of historical study. But it will come out more clear in the end. Troeltsch, in criticising Reischle's position, points out that the conviction which Reischle makes the basis of his judgment of other religions can be thought of in only two ways. Either this conviction is the result of a study of the facts, including the comparison of Christianity with other religions, in which case the method of the historian of religion is followed, or it is the result of our familiarity with Christianity arising from our lifelong contact with it, in which case it has no objective validity. Reischle is a Ritschlian, and does well to emphasize the great truth of his whole school that for personal religion the all-important thing is conviction. But it is a fault of the Ritschlians that they overlook the difficulty of settling questions of personal religion independent of all our other departments of life. Personal religion cannot be thus divorced from life as a whole. The demands of the intellect cannot be ignored.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

Das älteste Evangelium. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Ueberlieferung (The Earliest Gospel. A Contribution to the Understanding of the Gospel according to Mark and of the Earliest Gospel Tradition). By Johannes Weiss. Göttingen, 1903, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. At the outset it will be interesting to notice that Weiss places the date of this gospel at 64-66 A. D. He does this on the ground that it was evidently written after the death of Peter, and that it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, as Mark betrays just the slightest hint of the occurrence of that event. But he is not inclined to the view that the author was John Mark, Paul's companion. Notwithstanding this, he is of the opinion that the gospel betrays a decidedly Pauline element. He holds this on the ground that the gospel exhibits the misunderstandings and unbelief of the primitive disciples in a manner which would probably have occurred only on the basis of Pauline recollections. But there is no reason to suppose that Peter would not have recollected and related these things. Again, in connection with the emphasis which Mark's gospel gives to the sufferings and death of Christ he is inclined to see Pauline influence. But it is incredible that Paul alone should have originated the doctrines of the cross. Weiss thinks that for Mark the gospel was the message concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God; and that Mark conceived of Jesus as the supermundane, supernatural Son of God, who walked the earth in divine glory. But he also thinks that according to Mark the secret of his glory was revealed during the lifetime of Jesus only to his disciples. It was hidden from the mass of the people of set purpose. This hiding is manifested in the frequent instances in which Jesus refused to allow his wonderful works to be made known to the people. The motive for the concealment was to punish them for their

hardness of heart. Weiss is of the opinion that while Mark unduly emphasizes this phase of the ministry of Jesus there was some justification in Christ's own words. The thing was not made up out of the whole cloth. As to the purpose of the gospel, Weiss does not regard it exactly as doctrinal, but, on the other hand, he does not regard it as biographical. The memoirs and biographies of antiquity gave an account of the childhood and youth, and a personal description of the subject, and a real chronology. All these are wanting in Mark, who does not lay any stress upon a supposed development in the inner life of Jesus. Mark seems to have written in the interest of the propagation of Christianity. His purpose was to preach the gospel. As to the synoptic sources Weiss is doubtful about the two-source theory, and thinks, unjustly, that the holders of that view overlook the difficulties in the way of it. As a matter of fact, the holding of the view that the Gospel of Mark or a gospel essentially like it was the basis of the narratives in the gospels generally does not prevent one from maintaining that Matthew and Luke had a collection of sayings of Jesus from which they took much. Weiss thinks that for the most part the Gospel of Mark was composed of recollections of Peter, but that the author was some other than John Mark, the companion of Paul and Barnabas, and that John Mark may be the mysterious presbyter John of whom we hear so much and know so little in the early writings of the fathers. The work is one which will well repay careful study, and but the most meager outline of the work in some of its parts has here been given.

Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedæi. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Johannesevangelium (On the Death of the Sons of Zebedee. A Contribution to the History of the Gospel of John). By E. Schwartz. Berlin, 1904, Weidmann. The author of this book received his suggestion from a remark of Wellhausen on Mark 10. 39 in which Jesus says to James and John that they shall drink the cup that he drinks of and be baptized with the baptism that he is baptized with. Wellhausen says (Das Evangelium Marci, p. 90): "The prediction of martyrdom referred not alone to James, but also to John, and if it had been only half fulfilled it would hardly have found a place in the gospel. A strong doubt is thereby raised against the trustworthiness of the tradition that the apostle John died a natural death at a very advanced age." Schwartz looks upon it as a fixed fact that John and James suffered martyrdom at the same time. If one takes seriously the claim of the sons of Zebedee to the places of honor at the right and left hand of the returning Messiah the conclusion cannot be escaped that they both died as martyrs, and that they should have the chosen seats is only comprehensible if they died at the same time. Schwartz thinks this a strong confirmation of the assertion of Peplias as reported in an excerpt from his writings published in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, v. 2, 1888, p. 170, to the effect that John the Theologian and James his brother were put to death by the Jews. The account in Acts 12. 2 mentions only the death of

James, and Schwartz thinks the death of John was omitted because of the tradition of his living to an extreme old age. Not alone the tradition concerning John, but Gal. 2. 9 stands in the way of Schwartz's interpretation. So he undertakes to show that the John of the latter passage is not John the brother of James, but John Mark. He has to strike out Acts 12. 25 and 13. 5, 13 as unhistorical in order to make his point. But what is left—that is, Acts 12. 12 and 15. 37—could be understood of John Mark, especially if we distinguish him from the Mark of the Pauline epistles. But this is a very remarkable proceeding to eliminate inconvenient passages and to fix the identities of historical personages simply in the interest of an hypothesis and thus to reckon this proceeding as a part of the proof of the hypothesis. But it still remains for Schwartz to explain the origin of the tradition of John's death in extreme old age and of his residence in Ephesus. As to the old age the argument is somewhat complicated. It can be reduced, however, to comparatively simple terms. That Papias called John the Theologian is evidence that he knew the fourth gospel, and that he not only prized it as the best but regarded it as measurably in contrast with the synoptics. But he did not hold it as the latest gospel. His knowledge of the simultaneous death of John and James would forbid that. The criticism of the fourth gospel by the Alogians (Schwartz thinks the whole of that party consisted of one person, the Roman presbyter Gaius) led to the theory that that gospel was written in order to supplement the other three. This, of course, demanded a late date, and as the Johannine authorship was agreed upon it was necessary to correct the tradition of the simultaneous death of John and James. Thus the legend of John's extreme old age is accounted for by the desire of the Ephesians for the reputation of having great lights such as Rome possessed. One would suppose, however, that if the Ephesians wanted to boast of their great lights they would have chosen Paul, whose reputation was certainly greater than that of John. Besides, that passage in Papias of which so much is made does not say that John and James were put to death at the same time. Nor is it in any sense necessary to draw from Mark 10. 39 the conclusion that Wellhausen and Schwartz draw from it.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL

Theological Disputes in Norway. Everywhere the struggle between the old and the new goes forward. On the death of Professor Petersen, of the University of Christiania, a new professor of dogmatics had to be chosen. According to custom a committee was appointed, and candidates were invited to send in printed works and to deliver two trial lectures. Two candidates complied, one of them a certain Pastor Alding. The other candidate was, after test, not regarded as qualified. Pastor Alding satisfied the committee of his theological ability and of his orthodoxy on the person and work of Christ, but on the subject of the sacrament he was unsatisfactory. For, lo! while he believed for sound reasons in continuing the custom of baptizing children he denied the theory of the

opus operatum. In other words, not baptism but personal faith saves! For this "modern" theory he was rejected. A strife lasting many months with much heat, not to say ill will, arose, and a new committee had to be appointed and the work begun afresh.

Blasphemy according to German Law. The Social-Democratic editor of the *Volkswille*, in Hanover, was recently sentenced to three months' imprisonment on the charge of blasphemy. The occasion was a satirical article ridiculing a much discussed process at law. In this article Editor Westermeyer represented Martin Luther as having translated and published in the Chinese empire speeches of a certain Jesus, born in Nazaretto in Palestine, in which Jesus spoke in an unheard-of way about the scribes and Pharisees, thereby stirring up the people against internal affairs of the state. This Jesus, who was proved to be an agitator and deceiver of the people, was declared by Luther to be the Son of God who came from heaven. The empress of China, whose son was called the son of heaven, felt herself insulted that anyone should call any but her son the son of heaven, and especially one judicially condemned. The prosecuting attorney sought in vain for anyone who had been offended by this satire. Two prominent clergymen were called and declared that they saw nothing blasphemous in the words, and especially when the purpose was considered. Two others who confessed that they had not read the article thought certain expressions read to them were blasphemous. And so Editor Westermeyer was condemned although he declared his reverence both for Jesus and Luther, and another layer was added to the stone wall separating the German masses from the church.

The Roman Church and the Worship of Mary. On the thirtieth of November, 1904, a world congress was opened in Rome in honor of the fiftieth year of the proclamation of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. A brief in the same spirit was read from the Pope, praising all who were in attendance for the purpose of devising plans by which to propagate this doctrine and the worship of Mary. Among the speakers was the Cardinal Archbishop Fischer, of Cologne. The religious editor of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* said that the archbishop, together with his diocese, intended to erect a Church of the Virgin Mary as a jubilee monument, thereby proving that the Cologne of the twentieth century was the equal of the Cologne of the fourteenth century in its love for the Virgin. Cologne, he said, has been and is yet *Romana Ecclesia fidelis filia*, but it is equally also *fidelis filia* B. M. V. On December 4 the congress closed, and on December 8 the Pope celebrated high mass in connection with the crowning of a statue of Immaculate Conception. The Roman Catholic world moves, no doubt, but which way?

GLIMPSES OF REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES

Mr. ALFRED AUSTIN, nominally the Poet-laureate of England, having affirmed that there is a growing distaste for the higher forms of poetry, various comments have been offered or called out from publishers, poets, and editors. An English critic, Edward Thomas, says that the poets of to-day are "a crowd of pleasant singers but no heaven-sent choir." Bliss Perry says that "poets to-day are not working at their trade." Among the publishers, John Lane reports that "there has not, at any time, been so much good poetry written as there is to-day. Every week there comes before me, in manuscript, verse which, if it had been written in the early part of the nineteenth century, would have won renown for its authors;" while Houghton, Mifflin & Co. suggest that Mr. Austin may be misled by the distaste which the public manifest for his own writings, which his self-esteem considers to be among the "higher forms of poetry"; and these publishers report from their experience that edition after edition of all great poetry is called for, and that, so far from the demand decreasing, it increases with enormous strides. The Critic (New York) recently invited the opinions of a score or more of American poets and published them in its March number. Henry van Dyke, supposing for the moment that there may be some justification for Mr. Austin's complaint, says: "Who can tell what are the causes which make people more hurried, more tired, more feverish for the strong excitement of speed, more thirsty for the crude stimulants of sensation, and less susceptible to the high and delicate pleasures of the imagination? Perhaps commercialism, or militarism, or material luxury has something to do with it. Perhaps the modern pulpit is at fault—it is safe to blame the preachers for almost anything that seems unfortunate. Perhaps the teaching of literature in our colleges and universities has become desiccated, so that there are many professors who can show you how to pull a book to pieces, but few who can help you understand and enjoy it. I do not feel competent to pass judgment upon these questions." One of the poets whose views were solicited by The Critic is Frederick Lawrence Knowles, who sees no reason to find fault with the reception accorded to-day to real poetry. As to the alleged "slump in poetry," Mr. Knowles replies as follows, and with his judgment we agree: "I firmly believe that poetry is more popular than ever. One reason for this conviction is the fact that the magazines continue to print so much verse. Editors never conduct a periodical merely for their own satisfaction—if they attempt to, they are not editors long. On the contrary, they are as keenly sensitive to variations in popular taste as a barometer is to changes in the weather. The law of supply and demand obtains here as everywhere. Editors would cease to print verse if subscribers ceased to want it. And the fact that most of the verse printed is without special distinction serves only to confirm me in my view. If the reading public are so incurably addicted to poetry that

they prefer indifferent verse in their magazines to the complete absence of verse, only one conclusion can fairly be drawn. But if there is a market for even the artificial, self-conscious poems of the magazines, there is a far readier welcome for work that makes a genuine human appeal. We are tempted to look back upon the heyday of Longfellow's fame as to a lost golden age. And yet Mr. Riley's poems sell far more widely than Longfellow's ever did. Childe Harold and The Raven leaped into fame no more quickly than The Man with the Hoe, and reached the eyes of no such extensive circle of readers. What would Browning not have given, as a young man, for the audience that awaits every new poetic drama of Stephen Phillips, or volume of lyrics by William Watson? And what English-speaking poet from Chaucer to the present has commanded, during his lifetime, half the number of readers that greets every new ballad of Mr. Kipling? For the first time in history, telegraph and cable bring the whole reading world to the feet of the poet who, like Kipling or Swinburne, has something of international interest to say. Consider the fact, for a moment, that, according to the trustworthy statistics of the Publishers' Weekly, the new books of 'poetry and the drama' published in the United States during 1903 numbered 421, and during 1904 (a Presidential year at that) numbered 530. Then add the fact that several metropolitan dailies have lately adopted the policy of adding to their editorial page one celebrated poem a day; and throw in, for good measure, the fact that in the department of 'Notes and Queries' conducted by so many journals, the great majority of inquiries still relate to the title, authorship, or text of favorite poems, and you begin to gain from these and similar suggestive indications, faith in the truth of Arnold's *dictum* that 'the future of poetry is immense.' Let another poet with a real message appear, he is destined at once to command an audience which will astound the timid apologist for modern verse, and drive the pessimist quite out of business. A gentleman high in the counsels of the publishing house which issues more poetry of merit than perhaps any other on America, recently informed me that this distinguished firm derives more income annually from the sale of the standard American poets whose copyrights they own than for the works of any novelist on their list. The demand for the writings of our better-known poets is constant and increasing. What city or school library can afford to be without the collected works of Longfellow, Lowell, and Whittier? Even in the days of the famous 'blue and gold poets,' the place of this trio was no more firmly settled than now in the affections of American readers. Indeed, it was probably less so. If Will Carleton outsells Aldrich, Sill, and Gilder to-day, it is equally true that the blue and gold editions enshrined not only the poems of Tennyson, Bryant, and Holmes, but also the effusions of Sprague, Willis, George P. Morris, Pierpont, and Tupper, and the innocuous verses of those good ladies, Mrs. Sigourney, Felicia Hemans, and L. E. L., while Saxe was for many years far more popular than the author of the Bigelow Papers. There has always been a small upper circle of readers which demands artistic work, but it was formerly much more limited than to-day. The men and women who would have reveled, two generations ago, in

such moralizing commonplace as Young's Night Thoughts and Pollock's Course of Time, and one generation ago in such sentimentalizing commonplace as Lucile and Bittersweet, are reading to-day Browning, Maeterlinck, Ibsen, Phillips, and Yeats. Even looked at from a commercial point of view, which furnishes the only test that would be convincing to many, the place of poetry in our time is vastly better than of old. How meager was the income made by the older poets, except as they were also teachers, lecturers, and doctors! Yet I was talking only the other day with an American poet hardly yet middle-aged, who told me he had made more than thirty thousand dollars from verse alone. This figure represented his earnings from newspaper and humorous rhymes and from lyrics composed for the librettos of comic operas, as well as from magazine verse and published books of poems. And yet this gentleman, whose work is very clever, is thought of rather as a popular journalist and public reader than as a poet. He is at best distinctly in the 'minor group,' and I find that his name is unmentioned in Miss Rittenhouse's recent volume on the Younger American Poets or even in Stedman's encyclopedic Anthology. Yes, the public wants poetry of all kinds, from the humbler and more ephemeral varieties to the higher, and, what is more, is willing to pay good money for it. It does not want, however, verse that is imitative, involved, obscure, or oversubjective, or poetry whose underlying basis is—to use Whitman's phrase—"a denial and insult to democracy." The poet's audience is enormously greater than ever before, and our free public libraries and free public schools are constantly augmenting it. There never was such an opportunity. It rests alone with the poets to see and to grasp it." We are told that the following is "the opinion of a well known writer of the higher forms of poetry"; we will guess Richard Watson Gilder: "I feel as much exercised at the suggestion that people are 'losing their taste for the higher forms of poetry' as I should at that of their 'losing their taste' for food, sunlight, companionship, love, or adventure. Poetry appeals to a perfectly primitive and perfectly ineradicable passion, and as long as man is human he must and will continue to delight in it."

WINTHROP PACKARD, writing from the West Indies to the New York Evening Post, gives the following account of the little town of Samana in the island of San Domingo, and of a colony of Methodists there: "Just as you enter Samana Bay there is a great headland, Cape Samana, which bears a grotesque resemblance to a human head. Its top is covered with negro wool, while from its chin a long Uncle Sam whisker sweeps to the tide. The facial outline is quite clearly at first that of a snub-nosed, thick-lipped African, but as you go on up the bay it changes. The nose grows clear-cut, the thick lips draw in, and the last you see of it is a well-modeled Anglo-Saxon type. The sailormen say this is prophetic of changes to come to the country, but I notice through it all the negro wool remains. Samana Bay might better be called Samana Gulf. Its two great headlands are well down on the horizon, one from another, and the bay itself is

thirty miles long by fifteen broad. All the navies in the world might congregate there, as President Grant said, and be jolly well wrecked, too, if they caught a hurricane, for the bay is so big it is like an open roadstead. It has reefs and shallows on either shore, and much of the southern shore is flat and would give full sweep to the wind. Near its entrance is a group of islands, and nestling behind these in a beautiful but little harbor is the town of Samana. One or two of the big ships of all the navies of the world would find snug and safe anchorage here, but not many. There is not room. Samana is pretty, from a safe distance. Near, you lose the enchantment. Revolutionists have burned it several times, and it has risen from its ashes only in part. It numbers only a few hundred inhabitants. Yet it is noteworthy for one thing. In it dwells a considerable population of American negroes. Long ago, in 1824, or thereabouts, there was quite a movement in the states for the emigration of American colored people to the tropics, and from Delaware and the Carolinas in the main came to Samana a delegation of colonists which settled and grew up with the country. Some of them did it very well, too, for one of them, known as Mother Wright, is over a hundred years old, still lives, and has descendants numbering a hundred and fifty. Another, Mother Dismay, is undismayed at a hundred and seven years. All these people are vigorous Methodists, and shout for their religion and their country, which they still claim is the United States. When the revolutions rage about them they produce American flags, and hanging them over their doors defy the dusky warriors of the uprising. I met the Rev. Mr. James, pastor of the Methodist church, which has one hundred and fifty communicants of American descent, besides others from the Dominicans. These negroes have been fairly prosperous, says their pastor, but only after the fashion of the country. They could hardly be so in any other way. They have a climate that gives a man little concern as to clothes, and the hills are full of fruit, and the bay of fish. They can be lightermen, fishermen, sailors, and planters in a small way, and one even became a locally celebrated revolutionist. If the country could be stable they would be fairly prosperous, but as it is their lot is a rather hard one. The pastor himself comes of a line of ministers who have preached to the exiles since they came, and is still at it. He is a sober little black man, who looks wisely at you through steel-bowed spectacles, and is very much in earnest in his solicitude for the welfare of his people."

BOOK NOTICES

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE

The Unaccountable Man. By DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D. 12mo, pp. 310. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Twenty-nine sermons from the pulpit of the Marble Collegiate Church, New York city. The first is on the text, "What manner of man is this?" It begins by saying that the question of questions is not "What think ye of Christianity?" but "What think ye of Christ?" All the truths of Christianity radiate from him. Not dogmatic apologetics, but the Person of Christ, is the stronghold of the Christian church. The sermon goes on to point out Christ's extraordinary and mysterious purity, wisdom, power, and benignity—all inexplicable on the theory that he is mere man. Then the manifold claims and testimony of Christ himself as to his nature, rank, power, and mission. It concludes thus: "One thing is perfectly clear: Jesus was what he declared himself to be, or else he was not even a good man. He stated his claims in unequivocal words, and the reason why he was crucified was that he claimed to be divine. His enemies, in order to accomplish his death, laid many things to his charge. He was accused of sedition; but that fell through. He was accused of refusing to pay tribute to Caesar; but that also came to naught. He was accused of putting himself forward as a rival claimant to the throne; but that, too, was thrown out of court. All that was left of the indictment was this: 'He maketh himself equal with God.' And it was under this charge that he was sentenced to the cross. Why did he not deny the accusation? He might have saved himself with a word; but he never uttered it. *He died for making himself equal with God.* It is clear that Jesus was either more or less than the best of men. If Christ was what he claimed to be, he is worthy of all adoration and service; if not, he should be repudiated as an impostor, since by no stretch of imagination can he be regarded as merely a good man. The place to study Jesus is in the dark tragedy of the cross. The centurion who had charge of the crucifixion watched him during the hours of his mortal anguish; heard his 'It is finished'; and when all was over felt constrained to say, 'Verily this was a righteous man.' But the soldier could not stop there; he had not uttered all the truth. And as he rode down from the scene of the tragedy to Jerusalem, where the evening lamps were now kindling, he turned and looked backward. The dark cross stood outlined on the crest against the twilight sky; and the centurion spoke again, 'Verily this was the Son of God!'" Preaching of the power of Satan in human life, Dr. Burrell says: "At the risk of being deemed a setter forth of old-fashioned truth, I venture the statement that nothing in the spiritual realm is more clearly demonstrated than the personality of Satan. Our Lord has put himself upon record in the petition, 'Lead us not into

temptation, but deliver us from the Evil One.' It seems to me strange that a fact so widely attested in human experience, recognized in all ethnic religions and accepted through all centuries, should be called in question. As I walked home from an evening service with my church treasurer twenty years ago, we spoke of certain deeds of violence which were reported to have been recently perpetrated in the neighborhood by a mysterious garroter. My friend, the treasurer, was incredulous, saying that the whole matter was a hoax and an unfounded rumor, and the 'garrote' an impossibility. I had scarcely seated myself at home when there came a violent ring at the door and my treasurer entered, announcing excitedly that he had been waylaid and relieved of the evening collection. When I suggested that the garrote was an impossibility he replied at once, 'A rumor could not place its knee in the middle of my back, throw its arm around my neck to choke me, and leave a black mark like this.' Now, Satan is not a rumor; we have felt his power; he has left his mark upon us; what is to be gained by denying it?" A sermon on "The Bright Side of Failure" has this illustration: "On the night of the battle of Marston Moor, when the parliamentary army had been defeated by Rupert and his Cavaliers, Oliver Cromwell, the captain of the 7th Troop of Horse, said to his commander, 'The sun has gone down, but the moon is still full; let me advance my men!' And before daybreak he won a victory, driving the Cavaliers like chaff before the wind. Blessed is the man who when the sun is down goes on fighting by moonlight. It is so easy to quit; and God loves not quitters. Pluck up heart, spite of all the day's failures. Has the sun gone down? Fight on! There is still light enough to see by. Quit you like a man to the end! And God will be with you." Dr. Burrell believes in biblical experts, but says: "The true 'biblical experts' are not such as dwell in cloisters and pass upon the Scriptures by the light of midnight oil, but rather those who test the effectiveness of the Word of God in the thick of the fight on the high places of the field. The best judge of a Damascus blade is not a metallurgist, but a soldier who adventures his life upon the quality of the steel, who knows what it has done and can do. The reason why biblical criticism does not awaken much interest in missionary fields is because a man in active service is unlikely to interest himself in demonstrating that his only weapon, which is the Word of God, is a wooden sword." Speaking of the magnificent results already achieved by foreign missions, our preacher says: "To speak of the cost of missionary evangelization is to argue the question on the lowest level; but the simple fact is that no gold-bearing bonds have ever yielded such an income. The amount expended has been but the pin money of the church. There is more money in the finger rings of God's people to-day than in the treasuries of all the boards engaged in the evangelization of the world. What our churches have invested thus far is less than one third of the estimated fortune of a single American multimillionaire, and about one seventh the cost of the British campaign in the Transvaal." Ex-President Benjamin Harrison, speaking at the Ecumenical Conference on Missions held in New York a few years ago, pointed to a Hindu woman who sat

beside him on the platform, and said: "If I had been worth a million and had given it all to foreign missions, and if there were nothing to show for it but this one convert from Brahmanism, I would not want my money back." To this Dr. Burrell adds: "And if all the money and effort thus far spent had not made so much as a momentary rift in the deep darkness of the pagan world, we should still have no alternative but to obey our marching orders, 'Go ye into all the world and evangelize!' But no such strain has been put upon our faith and courage. Great have been the results. And now to the old question, 'What of the night?' there is but one answer from the missionary stations of the world, 'The morning cometh!'" One sermon begins thus: "The Bible is a book of therapeutics. It offers specifics for all the ills that human souls are heir to. Here is one for heart trouble: 'Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me.' For pain of conscience, due to conviction of sin: 'Come now, saith the Lord, let us reason together; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' For a morbid memory, dwelling on a mislived past: 'Forgetting the things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, let us press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' For insomnia: 'I will both lay me down in peace and sleep, for thou, Lord, only makest me dwell in safety.' For nervous prostration, resulting from fret and worry: 'Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; your Father careth for them, shall he not much more care for you, O ye of little faith?' For hypochondria, its symptoms being doubt, discouragement, and fear: 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.'"

The Forgiveness of Sins, and Other Sermons. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D. 12mo, pp. 206. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

This volume of fifteen sermons, "first preached from the pulpit of Queen's Cross Free Church, Aberdeen," though dedicated to "old comrades," finds a welcome in the hearts of many friends unknown to their author. "Literature and art," writes Dr. Smith in the sermon on "The Song of the Well," "have no more real use for us than to throw us back with new light upon ourselves and our work; showing us how high we stand and how glorious it may be." These are sermons that show the glory of the preacher of a positive message for a world of sin. Noticeable indeed is the fact that the first sermon—the one which gives a title to the book—treats of "The Forgiveness of Sins." "In our youth religion attracts us more by the ideals and aspirations with which she inspires our strength than by the remedies and reliefs which she offers to our weakness. But as the years go on it is the sense of the need of forgiveness of which we became most aware. . . . In what does the forgiveness of sins consist. . . . The element in forgiveness which the Bible most frequently emphasizes is God's new trust in the soul he has pardoned; the faith that despite our frailty, our unworthiness, our guilt; despite the mistrust and despair which the memory of sin induces, God still trusts us, God believes us capable of doing better, God confides to us

the interests and responsibilities of his work on earth." Everywhere in these sermons there are evidences of a most sympathetic study of human nature and human institutions. The student of the Bible knows equally well the man he meets in daily life. Notice, for instance, this summary of the place of the Bible in the sermon on "The Word of God": "One could prove that the Bible built the home and provoked the beginnings of popular education; that it molded new languages; that it articulated and enforced the efforts of young nations toward independence and their destined work for humanity; that it brought health to art and literature; that it enlightened the ignorant and ennobled the humble; that it gave courage to lonely men to stand alone for truth and justice; and that it endowed the oppressed poor of all the centuries with an energy and a hope of struggle with which nothing else could have inspired them." Surely these are the words of a student, and yet the devices of the so-called "scholarly" preacher are lacking—and his sermons are thereby the gainer. There are few quotations, and of the few almost all are from the Scriptures. The pages are broken only two or three times by poetry. There is nothing labored—nothing overcarefully done, nothing changed evidently from its original form. We have the sermons as they were preached—and the love of the preacher for his people and his exultation over his opportunity are not disguised. There is only one illustration, and that from his own personal experience. "I remember," says he in his sermon on "Our Lord's Example in Prayer," "some years ago climbing the Weisshorn, above the Zermatt Valley, with two guides. . . . My leading guide stood aside to let me be first on the top. And I with the long labor of the climb over, and exhilarated by the thought of the great view awaiting me, but forgetful of the high gale that was blowing on the other side of the rocks, sprang eagerly up them and stood erect to see the view. The guide pulled me down—'On your knees, sir; you are not safe there except on your knees.'" There is no attempt at striking originality; still it may be questioned whether ever before a preacher found so much—if indeed anything—in the item in the record of the journeyings of Israel found in Num. 21. 16-18, which the preacher calls happily "The Song of the Well." Few men would make Gideon the central figure in two sermons on doubt—and yet each one who reads them is eager to do so at the next opportunity. "It is remarkable," says Dr. Smith, "that God chose a man who not only had felt the strain of these terrible times but whom the strain had wearied and torn with many doubts. For the very highest work God often chooses men who have doubted. . . . Doubt, if it be honest, means generally the mind to think and the heart to sympathize; and without thought and sympathy I suppose not God himself could make much of any man." Whatever the theme, the sermon leads to Christ. In the sermon on Esau, for example, he says: "Above all, then, lay hold on Christ. He is near you—nearer your youth than ever; if you refuse him now, he can appear to your later years. . . . Have you ever understood what he desires of you? It is not the taking of an arbitrary bond. It is not trust in a bare transaction. It is not assent to a creed. It is the giving of the heart

and will to a living love and victorious example which have never failed any who have put their trust in him." The other sermons in this list, as suggestive as any of those referred to, are on the themes, "Temptation," "While Ye Are in the Light," "The Two Wills," "The Moral Meaning of Hope," "The Good Samaritan," "To Him that Overcometh," and two "Sermons Before Communion."

The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D. 12mo, pp. 233. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, 50 cents net.

The author of this work is well known as an exponent of the so-called "advanced higher criticism" of the Bible, and we are not disappointed in our expectation to find his views presented frequently in these pages. Yet the reconstruction of the text according to the most recent opinions is not the striking feature in this book. Its plan is simple, to classify the teachings of Jesus Christ. With reference to method, he finds four kinds of the teaching in the recorded words of Jesus: 1. The parabolical; 2. The gnomic form, or *logia*, after the manner of the wisdom-literature of the Old Testament; 3. The expositions and application of Old Testament teaching, such as were called "Halacha" by the Jews; 4. The prophetic teachings. The principal words of Jesus are arranged under these four divisions. It is the belief of this author that the greater portion of the ethical teaching of Jesus was given originally in the form of the Hebrew Wisdom, in poetic lines, like those in the book of Proverbs. This he affirms to have been the method of the rabbis and wise men of the Jewish people. He would print nearly all the words of Jesus in this manner:

"Whoso findeth his life shall lose it;
And whoso loseth his life shall find it."
"A servant is not greater than his lord;
Neither is one that is sent greater than he that sent him."
"Whosoever doeth the will of God,
The same is my brother and my mother."
"Ask and it shall be given you.
Seek and ye shall find.
Knock and it shall be opened unto you.
For everyone that asketh, receiveth.
And he that seeketh, findeth.
And to him that knocketh, it shall be opened."

Our author would arrange most of the matter in the teachings of Christ, as given in the gospels, in the form of verses like those above. Another classification given is that by subjects, the matter of Christ's teaching regarding the Will of the Father, the Word of Jesus, the Kingdom of God, and other topics, sixteen in all. The arrangement and treatment of these subjects is striking and suggestive. Complete indexes, both topical and textual, add greatly to the usefulness of this book. Some of the opinions expressed in this work will not be acceptable to all its readers, but they will suggest thought and inquiry, and many preachers and Bible students will find the book helpful.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE

Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses. By HENRY SIDGWICK. 8vo, pp. 374. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$2.50.

Marian Evans Cross said Henry Sidgwick was a man whose friends tacitly expected him to conform to moral standards higher than they themselves cared to maintain. That this was true of him in comparison with Mrs. Cross will not be disputed. F. W. H. Myers says that Sidgwick is worthy to receive the tribute which Marcus Aurelius paid to his honored teacher, Maximus: "From Maximus I learned self-government, and not to be led aside by anything; and cheerfulness in all circumstances, even in illness; and a just admixture in the moral character of sweetness and dignity; and to do what was set before me without complaining. I observed that everybody believed that he thought as he spoke, and that in all that he did he never had any bad intention; and he never showed amazement or surprise, nor did he ever laugh to disguise his vexation, nor, on the other hand, was he ever passionate or suspicious. He was accustomed to do acts of beneficence, and was ready to forgive, and was free from all falsehood. He presented the appearance of a man who could not be diverted from right. I observed, too, that no man could ever think that he was despised by Maximus, or ever venture to think himself a better man than Maximus." There is no doubt that Henry Sidgwick was a man of singular sweetness, sincerity, and purity. He was the first President of the Society for Psychical Research. He engaged in the work of that society, investigating spiritualistic phenomena, in the hope that the English mind with its uncompromising matter-of-factness might be able to put the final question to the Universe with such determination and steady persistence as to get from the unseen world some answer, some manifestation, which might be scientific proof of the reality of a spirit world surrounding us and point-blank evidence of human immortality. Such scientific proof he did not obtain, but he was a nobly humble investigator seeking truth and fact; and he felt sure that "the humblest scouts who loyally strive to push forward the frontier of Science, even though Science at first disown them, are certain to hear, in time, her marching legions possess the unfrequented way." In his last illness he said to a devoted friend who had come to see him and was about leaving him, "As I look back on life I see many wasted hours. Yet I cannot be sorry that you should idealize me, if that shows that I have made my ideals felt. We must idealize or we should cease to struggle." The volume of essays and addresses before us, collected and edited, since his death, by his wife and son, falls into three divisions, according as they deal with literature, or economics and sociology, or education. First is a Westminster Review essay on Professor J. R. Seeley's book, *Ecce Homo*; next a Macmillan's Magazine article on Matthew Arnold; next a study of the poems and prose of Arthur Hugh Clough; next two articles on Shakespeare, with special reference to Julius Cæsar, Coriolanus, and Macbeth. Then a group of discussions of the Scope and Method of Economic Science, Economic Socialism, Political Prophecy and

Sociology, the Relation of Ethics to Sociology. Then others on the Theory of Classical Education, Idle Fellowships, and the Pursuit of Culture as an Ideal. Discussing Professor Seeley's book, Mr. Sidgwick notes with it that Christ's teachings make it the positive duty of his followers to attempt the restoration of the criminal classes. Practical men may plausibly urge that such an enterprise is hopeless, but Christ and Maud Ballington Booth and the Salvation Army lay it as a duty upon the church to reclaim the lost, because they do not think it Utopian to suppose that the church may be inspired by that enthusiasm for humanity which can charm away the bad passions of the wildest heart, and open to the savage and the outlaw lurking in moral wildernesses an entrancing view of the holy and tranquil order that broods over the streets and palaces of the city of God. Sidgwick closes his criticism of Seeley's *Ecce Homo* thus: "His method we think radically wrong; his conclusions only roughly and partially right. But the one thing in which we agree with him outweighs all else. We desire as sincerely as he does that the influence of Jesus on the modern world should increase and not decrease. That his book will produce this effect on the majority of readers we cannot doubt. We cannot possibly have sound history without uncompromising criticism and perpetual controversy; but it is good to be reminded from time to time to drop the glass of criticism and let the dust-clouds of controversy settle. Many students may be led by this book to contemplate devoutly and with more intelligent sympathy the one Life, the one Character, which the world may come to reverence more wisely, but can never love too well." Sidgwick's critical study of Clough and his poetry is extremely self-possessed, discerning, judicious, and lucid. The following is accurate and just: "The external aspect of Clough's career justifies our regarding his life as wasted—at best an interesting failure. [Every faithless, undecided life must inevitably be a failure.] Clough is a man always trying to solve insoluble problems and pondering the eternal mystery of existence—at once inert and restless, finding no fixed basis for life nor any elevated sphere for action, tossed from one occupation to another, and exhausting his energies in work that brought little profit and no fame; a man who cannot suit himself to the world nor the world to himself, who will neither heartily accept earthly conditions and pursue the objects of ordinary mankind, nor positively reject them as a devotee of something different and definite; a dreamer who will not even dream pleasant dreams—a man who makes the worst of both worlds." Clough once wrote of himself: "My reasoning powers are weak, my memory doubtful and confused, my conscience, it may be, calloused or vitiated." As to Clough's poetry, it is not harsh to say in plain candor that very little of it is worth anybody's reading. It really has little or nothing in it to make men wiser or stronger or happier or better. For one thing, skeptical, cynical irony never did anybody any good; and of that there is too much in Clough. In one of his unfinished poems he puts very fairly the feeling toward religion of the average worldling, who makes no pretension of being pious himself, but who considers religion indispensable as a guardian of order, propriety, secur-

ity, and a sort of soothing sirup to the mind in trying hours and experiences. The average well-to-do, respectable man of the world would view with apprehension anything that threatened the overthrow of religion. Clough pictures him as happening to pass along where an attempt is being made to destroy the Christian Faith; this is what the worldling does and says:

"And the great World, it chanced, came by that way,
And stopped, and looked, and spoke to the police,
And said the attempt, for order's sake and peace,
Most certainly must be suppressed, the nuisance cease.
His wife and daughter must have where to pray,
And Whom to pray to, at the least one day
In seven, and something sensible to say.
Whether the Fact so many years ago
Had, or not, happened, how was he to know?
He took, himself, no living interest in it,
Yet he had always heard that it was so.
As for himself, perhaps it was all one;
And yet he found it not unpleasant, too,
On Sunday morning in the roomy pew,
To see the thing with such decorum done.
As for himself, perhaps it was all one;
Yet on one's deathbed, all men always said,
It was a comfortable thing to think upon
The Atonement and the Resurrection of the dead.
So the great World, as having said his say,
Unto his country house pursued his way."

In the essay on Clough this bit is quoted from Emerson: "Everything is beautiful, seen from the point of the intellect; but all is sour if seen as experience. Details are always melancholy; the plan is seemly and noble. It is strange how painful is the actual world—the painful kingdom of time and place. There dwell care and canker and fear. In the realm of thought, in the ideal, is immortal hilarity, the rose of joy." Here is one verse from Clough which reminds us of Tennyson's question, "If the wages of virtue be dust, would we have the heart to endure for the life of the worm and the fly?"

"But for the steady fore-sense of a freer and larger existence,
Think you that man could consent to be circumscribed here into action?
But for assurance within of a limitless ocean divine—o'er
Whose great tranquil depths unconscious the wind-tossed surface
Breaks into ripples of trouble that come and change and endure not—
But that in this, of a truth, we have our being, and know it,
Think you we men could submit to live and move as we do here?"

And then he exhorts that, as limited beings, we leave knowledge to God, who has it completely and always, and beyond this

"Let us in His sight accomplish our petty particular doings—
Yes, and contented sit down to the victual that He has provided."

Referring to Luther, who found irreligion and secularity marking the educated class, including the leading clergy of Germany, the most civil-

ized country in Europe, and who was not willing to let Leo X and Company go on secularizing the age and commercializing religion, Clough says in an ironical passage:

"He must forsooth make a fuss and distend his huge Wittenberg lungs,
And bring back theology once yet again in a flood upon Europe."

In his essay on the Pursuit of Culture as an Ideal, Sidgwick asks again the old question of the time of Socrates, "Can virtue be taught?" and answers, "Virtue can be taught by a teacher who loves virtue, but not otherwise; since, as Goethe says, 'Speech that is to stir the heart must from the heart have sprung.'" We have not space to notice the weightier essays which make the bulk of the volume, and in which, for educators, sociologists and political economists, the greater part of its value is found.

Personal and Ideal Elements in Education. By HENRY CHURCHILL KING, President of Oberlin College; Author of *Reconstruction in Theology*, *Theology and the Social Conscience*. 12mo, pp. 271. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book has much to say to teachers, students, and ministers. The principal conviction underlying its chapters is that in education, in ethics, in religion, and in all true living, the most important facts are persons; and the proposition most insisted on is the essentially fundamental nature of religion in all life, individual and national. Religious faith logically underlies all reasoning, all work worth doing, all strenuous moral endeavor, and all earnest social service. The two chapters of deepest interest to the minister and lying most within his sphere are those on "Christian Training and the Revival as Methods of Converting Men," and "How to Make a Rational Fight for Character," which fill the latter half of the volume. Speaking of the absolutely fundamental nature of religion and its indispensableness to human nature and life, President King repeats that great sentence of Augustine that has voiced the heart of the church through the centuries: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee;" and then says: "In our deepest nature we are religious, and we cannot escape it. Man is alone the religious animal, and he cannot escape the demand of religion until he escapes from his deepest self. No wonder Sabatier says man is incurably religious; or that Royce should give the highest worth to religion among the interests of humanity; or that Coe should affirm that 'worship is so wrought into the fiber of our minds that we need only come to ourselves to find God'; or that Granger should say, in arguing for the right of free thought in matters of religion, 'The religious sentiment needs no adventitious aids; for it is safe here to trust the unbiased instincts of mankind. So far as prophecy can reach, it seems certain that man will always worship, and also that the symbols of the Christian tradition will afford the ultimate vehicle of his devotion. We can hardly do less, therefore, than to confess with George Macdonald that 'Life and religion are one, or neither is anything. Religion is no way of life, no show of life, no observance of any sort. It is neither the food nor the medicine of being. It is life essential.' Religion is the one absolutely fundamental necessity." Referring to the reasonable-

ness and, so to speak, the naturalness of spiritual communion between the Great Spirit and man who also is a spirit, Dr. King quotes the familiar sentence from Pfeiderer: "Why should it be less possible for God to enter into loving fellowship with us than for men to do so with each other? I should be inclined to think that He is even more capable of doing so." In writing of Christian training and the revival, five dangers of the merely educational method in religion are pointed out: 1. The danger of overemphasis on the intellectual side. 2. The danger of lacking a powerful grip through feeling upon the life of a man. 3. The danger of losing the sense of God in it all. 4. The danger of losing a deep significant inner life as the support of all outer activity. 5. The danger of ignoring basic temperamental differences among men. Next some liabilities of the revival method are mentioned: 1. The mistake of demanding one uniform type of experience from all men; thus laying emphasis upon a particular form of religious experience rather than upon the real fundamental ethical relation to God and to men; and leading men to try to imitate others' experience; and sometimes throwing into darkness if not despair some of the most conscientious and sincere men and women because they had not attained to experiences related by persons of a different temperament and history. 2. The liabilities that sometimes attend sudden and marked experiences. 3. The danger of a somewhat mechanical and practically superstitious view of the work of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. 4. The danger of failure in sensitive, delicate reverence for the personality and the moral initiative of men. In President King's book there is no lack of emphasis upon the need and value of the crisis hours marked by awakenings of conscience, deep conviction, change of heart, when we pass from the easy and careless mood to the sober and strenuous state of thought and feeling—hours which make new men of us, and of which even Matthew Arnold wrote, when

"A bolt is shot back somewhere in our breast,
And a lost pulse of feeling stirs again."

Laying stress on the importance of religious feeling, Dr. King refers to the strong effort of William James to rehabilitate the element of feeling in religion and to subordinate its intellectual past, and quotes him where he says: "Individuality is founded in feeling; and the recesses of feeling are the only places in the world in which we catch real fact in the making, and directly perceive how events happen, and how work is actually done"; and Coe is quoted as saying that "We are suffering not from an excess of emotion in religion, but rather from the little emotion, from the narrowness of our emotional range." One chapter of preëminent practical value is the last, on "How to Make a Rational Fight for Character." It grew from the attempt to answer this question which an old pupil brought to the President of Oberlin, "What are we to do in those poorer movements when the higher motives have lost their power to appeal?" One answer given is: "In such low moments let a man say to himself, '*Everything is now at stake; it is fight or die.*' Let him say, 'I have simply to let myself go on along this line in which I am now tempted, to have it all over

ized country in Europe, and who was not willing to let Leo X and Company go on secularizing the age and commercializing religion, Clough says in an ironical passage:

"He must forsooth make a fuss and distend his huge Wittenberg lungs,
And bring back theology once yet again in a flood upon Europe."

In his essay on the Pursuit of Culture as an Ideal, Sidgwick asks again the old question of the time of Socrates, "Can virtue be taught?" and answers, "Virtue can be taught by a teacher who loves virtue, but not otherwise; since, as Goethe says, 'Speech that is to stir the heart must from the heart have sprung.'" We have not space to notice the weightier essays which make the bulk of the volume, and in which, for educators, sociologists and political economists, the greater part of its value is found.

Personal and Ideal Elements in Education. By HENRY CHURCHILL KING, President of Oberlin College; Author of *Reconstruction in Theology, Theology and the Social Conscience*. 12mo, pp. 277. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book has much to say to teachers, students, and ministers. The principal conviction underlying its chapters is that in education, in ethics, in religion, and in all true living, the most important facts are persons; and the proposition most insisted on is the essentially fundamental nature of religion in all life, individual and national. Religious faith logically underlies all reasoning, all work worth doing, all strenuous moral endeavor, and all earnest social service. The two chapters of deepest interest to the minister and lying most within his sphere are those on "Christian Training and the Revival as Methods of Converting Men," and "How to Make a Rational Fight for Character," which fill the latter half of the volume. Speaking of the absolutely fundamental nature of religion and its indispensableness to human nature and life, President King repeats that great sentence of Augustine that has voiced the heart of the church through the centuries: "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee;" and then says: "In our deepest nature we are religious, and we cannot escape it. Man is alone the religious animal, and he cannot escape the demand of religion until he escapes from his deepest self. No wonder Sabatier says man is incurably religious; or that Royce should give the highest worth to religion among the interests of humanity; or that Coe should affirm that 'worship is so wrought into the fiber of our minds that we need only come to ourselves to find God'; or that Granger should say, in arguing for the right of free thought in matters of religion, 'The religious sentiment needs no adventitious aids; for it is safe here to trust the unbiased instincts of mankind. So far as prophecy can reach, it seems certain that man will always worship, and also that the symbols of the Christian tradition will afford the ultimate vehicle of his devotion. We can hardly do less, therefore, than to confess with George Macdonald that 'Life and religion are one, or neither is anything. Religion is no way of life, no show of life, no observance of any sort. It is neither the food nor the medicine of being. It is life essential.' Religion is the one absolutely fundamental necessity." Referring to the reasonable-

ness and, so to speak, the naturalness of spiritual communion between the Great Spirit and man who also is a spirit, Dr. King quotes the familiar sentence from Pfeiderer: "Why should it be less possible for God to enter into loving fellowship with us than for men to do so with each other? I should be inclined to think that He is even more capable of doing so." In writing of Christian training and the revival, five dangers of the merely educational method in religion are pointed out: 1. The danger of overemphasis on the intellectual side. 2. The danger of lacking a powerful grip through feeling upon the life of a man. 3. The danger of losing the sense of God in it all. 4. The danger of losing a deep significant inner life as the support of all outer activity. 5. The danger of ignoring basic temperamental differences among men. Next some liabilities of the revival method are mentioned: 1. The mistake of demanding one uniform type of experience from all men; thus laying emphasis upon a particular form of religious experience rather than upon the real fundamental ethical relation to God and to men; and leading men to try to imitate others' experience; and sometimes throwing into darkness if not despair some of the most conscientious and sincere men and women because they had not attained to experiences related by persons of a different temperament and history. 2. The liabilities that sometimes attend sudden and marked experiences. 3. The danger of a somewhat mechanical and practically superstitious view of the work of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. 4. The danger of failure in sensitive, delicate reverence for the personality and the moral initiative of men. In President King's book there is no lack of emphasis upon the need and value of the crisis hours marked by awakenings of conscience, deep conviction, change of heart, when we pass from the easy and careless mood to the sober and strenuous state of thought and feeling—hours which make new men of us, and of which even Matthew Arnold wrote, when

"A bolt is shot back somewhere in our breast,
And a lost pulse of feeling stirs again."

Laying stress on the importance of religious feeling, Dr. King refers to the strong effort of William James to rehabilitate the element of feeling in religion and to subordinate its intellectual past, and quotes him where he says: "Individuality is founded in feeling; and the recesses of feeling are the only places in the world in which we catch real fact in the making, and directly perceive how events happen, and how work is actually done"; and Coe is quoted as saying that "We are suffering not from an excess of emotion in religion, but rather from the little emotion, from the narrowness of our emotional range." One chapter of preëminent practical value is the last, on "How to Make a Rational Fight for Character." It grew from the attempt to answer this question which an old pupil brought to the President of Oberlin, "What are we to do in those poorer movements when the higher motives have lost their power to appeal?" One answer given is: "In such low moments let a man say to himself, '*Everything is now at stake; it is fight or die.*' Let him say, 'I have simply to let myself go on along this line in which I am now tempted, to have it all over

with me, and to be lost, absolutely lost.'” One incident given to illustrate the fight for character is this: “There was seen some time ago, in the city of Denver, a man running, as for his life, through the suburbs of that city. An on-looker could scarcely have guessed what the man was running for. As a matter of fact, he was fighting for his very life against the liquor habit, and the appetite was fearfully strong upon him just then. He dared not stop to consider or argue the matter at all; he knew just one thing—he must get out of the range of the saloons or sink again into the abyss of ruin. His only safety was in running. So he ran and was saved.” Dr. King quotes from Hugh Price Hughes’s introduction to a recent edition of Wesley’s Journal: “He who desires to understand the real history of the English people during the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries should read most carefully three books—George Fox’s Journal, John Wesley’s Journal, and John Henry Newman’s *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*. . . . The Religious Question cannot be ignored. It is *the* Question; in the deepest sense it is the only Question. It has always determined the course of history everywhere.” He also quotes Brierley: “Spite of the modern assertion to the contrary, our problems of living are finally religious, and look to religion for their solution.” On another topic Emerson’s fine saying is quoted: “The office of a friend is to make us do our best.”

Niagara and Other Poems. By BENJAMIN COPELAND. 12mo, pp. 133. Buffalo and New York: The Matthews-Northrup Works. Sold by Eaton & Mains, New York, and by H. H. Otis’s Sons, Buffalo. Price, cloth, \$1.

These verses were born out of a soul’s life. They show a broadening and deepening of feeling from the author’s later experiences since the issue of his previous volume of poetry several years ago. This book takes its title from the opening apostrophe to the majesty and power of Niagara, which now the dry lips and greedy gulping thirst of commercialism are threatening to drink up entirely. Some poems of Nature follow; we should like to quote entire the ten simple yet exquisite verses entitled “The Meadow Air is Sweet.” Characterization and justification of the poet are in the verse:

“To lift and lighten the heart of man
Was ever the Poet’s lofty plan;—
Confederate with stars and sun,
His songs their radiant courses run.”

Some of these poems express the tender and trembling pathos, the submissive grief, of domestic bereavement. The touching verses entitled “Little Theodore,” on page 81, were finished in the morning of the day on which the beautiful boy’s face was covered with the coffin lid, the first copy of these verses clasped within his little fingers. The lines remind us of Browning’s Evelyn Hope. On page 85 is “The Easter Answer,” full of the Christian’s consolation at the grave-side. Most of the poems in this volume are religious and flow up from the deep places of the soul. “Out of the Depths” would be a not unsuitable title. Some of them are only one verse long, as “A Sure Foundation”:

"Hold firmly, for thy soul's behoof,
This holy faith, divinely broad:—
The good in us is blessed proof
Of goodness infinite in God."

Two admirable verses are entitled "Assurance":

"Not where the Martyrs knelt, but where we kneel,
Is holy ground for us and ours;—
Not what the Saints have felt, but what we feel,
With strength divine the fainting soul empowers.

"Not what the Apostles held, but what we hold,
Makes radiant death's dread mystery:—
From living faith, deep-welled, has onward rolled
The widening stream of Christian history."

The poems in this volume are pure, sensitive, alive, sincere, unstilted, genuine. They are capable of bringing a comforting, cheering, and inspiring message to many minds.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY

The Heart of Asbury's Journal. Edited by EZRA SQUIER TIPPLE, D.D. 8vo, pp. 720. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The making of this book is a distinct service to the church. It should stand on Methodist shelves alongside Wesley's Journals, which it resembles in piety and sense, in reflecting the prodigious labors and in giving the spirit of the life of one of the greatest of God's strong servants; the two books together recording the early history of Methodism in England and in America. No adequate portraiture of the character of Asbury exists as yet in our literature. We point out this lack as offering a fine chance for some master hand to achieve distinction and render a service by giving the church a great monograph on Francis Asbury. The nearest possible approach to that is the view of this heroic leader of American Methodism furnished by *The Heart of Asbury's Journal* now presented by Dr. Tipple. It is simple justice to say that the selections are so wisely made that the book before us justifies its title by giving us the parts which are most significant and essential, and which taken together set before us a complete picture of Asbury and his labors. In one comprehensive sentence in his Introduction Dr. Tipple describes the work of our great pioneer bishop, "who for half a century, like a spiritual Atlas, bore the American continent on his shoulders; builded altars in almost every city and town in the land and kindled thereon fires which have not yet gone out; heralded the doctrine of democracy when our nation was in the throes of a gigantic conflict with Paternalism and Aristocracy; inculcated respect for law and created ideals of righteousness and citizenship along the mountain roads, and through the trackless forests, where Civilization walked with slow yet conquering steps; kept Hope alive in thousands of hearts where Despair ever stood at the door with a coffin; startled the im-

penitent to action, halted the reckless in their mad pursuit after forbidden pleasures, comforted myriads in their sorrows and agonies, and like a tender mother cherished multitudes from New Hampshire to the Southern sea who had received remission of sins; and sowed the seeds which, growing up, have made Methodism in its history, its spirit, and its purpose an American Church." The Journal as presented in this volume begins with August 7, 1771, at Bristol, England, and ends with December 7, 1815, at Granby, South Carolina; although Asbury lived nearly four months after that last entry, preaching his last sermon at Richmond, Virginia, March 24, 1816, and dying twenty miles from Fredericksburg on Sunday, March 31, at the home of his friend George Arnold, in whose family burying ground his remains rested until removed to the vault of Eutaw Street Church in Baltimore, where they reposed until in 1854 they found their final rest in Mount Olivet Cemetery in Baltimore, in which are also the graves of Robert Strawbridge, Reuben Ellis, Wilson Lee, Nathan Richardson, Jesse Lee, Hamilton Jefferson, John Haggerty, Abner Neal, James Smith, Enoch George, John Emory, Beverly Waugh, and others of Methodism's glorious dead. The history of American Methodism up to 1815 is largely contained in Asbury's Journal, which has previously been published in three volumes, but Dr. Tipple has condensed into one volume, giving us the pith of the whole, and interspersing many concise but illuminating explanatory and historical notes. The intense ardor, incredible hardships, and fervent evangelism of the pioneer preachers are reflected in this Journal. It is difficult to choose what to select for quotation from the wonderful story of the life of this greatest of American itinerant bishops, who for thirty-two years traveled annually a larger episcopal see than any bishop of any church ever continuously ruled and covered. One thing which increases our wonder at his enormous labors is the fact that much of the time he traveled and toiled in a condition of ill health and suffering which would seem to forbid all exertion. In this appears the resolute will and the heroic fiber of the man. Another marked fact is that because of weakening illness, physical torture and exhaustion, and perhaps from a despondent tendency in his constitution, he suffered much from extreme depression of spirits, against which he often had a terrible fight. On May 26, 1799, his Journal says: "This day entered the state of Delaware. I have had great dejection of mind, and awful calculations of what may be and what may never be. I have now groaned along three hundred miles from Baltimore." In the summer of 1776 he spent a season at the hot springs of Virginia for the recovery of his health. Accommodations were not of the best. He writes: "The house in which I live at the springs is not the most agreeable; the size of it is twenty feet by sixteen, and there are seven beds and sixteen persons therein, and some noisy children. So I dwell among briars and thorns; but my soul is in peace." He criticises Samuel Spragg, one of his preachers, as follows: "He uses pompous, swelling words, which pass for something great with short-sighted people, but are not calculated to do them much spiritual good." One Sunday evening after a day of preaching, he found himself shut up in the company of "men who were destitute

of religion, and full of sin and politics." Of them he writes, "We were glad to have prayer in the morning and leave them. If there were no other hell than the company of wicked men, I would say, From such a hell, good Lord, deliver me!" He gives his experience with a family at whose house he was entertained at West Farms, near New York: "After supper I asked the family if we should have prayer. They looked at one another and said there was need enough. The next morning, when I asked a blessing before breakfast, they seemed amazed. I told them they lacked nothing but religion. The old father said it was not well to be too religious. The son said he thought we could not be too good." Of his first sermon after his ordination as bishop he says, "My mind was unsettled, and I was low in my testimony." In June, 1776, he was fined twenty-five dollars for preaching the gospel. The next June he laid aside his wig, and began the daily use of the cold bath for his health. In May, 1785, he called on George Washington, and heard him express his opinion against slavery. At Bath Springs he found "the living very expensive, four dollars per week." Concerning his Journals Asbury himself wrote, "Perhaps if they are not published before, they will be after my death, to let my friends and the world see how I have employed my time in America. I feel the worth of souls, and the weight of the pastoral charge, and that the conscientious discharge of its important duties requires something more than human learning, large salaries, or clerical titles of D.D., or even of Bishop." Sixteen years before his death Asbury tried to resign his episcopal office, but the General Conference refused to allow him to do so. In 1800, while traveling through Connecticut and Massachusetts he wrote: "The simplicity and frugality of New England are desirable—you see the woman a wife, a mother, mistress, and maid, and in all these characters a conversable woman; she seeth to her own house, parlor, kitchen, and dairy; here are no noisy negroes lounging and running about. If you wish to breakfast at six or seven o'clock there is no setting the table an hour before the provision can be produced." In South Carolina he writes: "I cannot record great things in religion in this quarter, *but cotton sells high*. I fear there is more gold than grace." In 1802, after preaching in a certain house in South Carolina he wrote: "It was not at all agreeable to me to see nearly a hundred slaves standing outside and peeping in at the door, while the house was half empty. They were not worthy to come in because they were black! Farewell to that house forever!" Leaving New York to travel through country regions in June, 1802, he indulges in this expression of his pleasure in the change: "How sweet to me are the moving and still-life scenes which now surround me on every side! The quiet country houses, the fields and orchards, bearing promises of the fruitful year, the hills and vales, and dewy meads, the flocks and herds, the gliding streams and murmuring brooks! And thou, too, Solitude, with thy attendants, Silence and Meditation, how dost thou solace my pensive mind after the tempest of fear, and care, and tumult, and talk, experienced in the noisy, bustling city!" Wherever he went, this great apostle not only preached and prayed, but sowed the seed of life by distributing tracts and pamphlets and books. Riding

through Pennsylvania he says: "People call me by my name as they pass me on the road, and I hand them a religious tract in German or English; or I call at a door for a glass of water, and leave a little pamphlet. How may I be more useful? I am old and feeble and sick, and can do little." In New York state he wrote: "We reached New Durham. I prayed at Runyan's and gave away books. The people wanted to hear me; spent with labor and sorrow, how could I preach? I hope the truth was felt." Stopping at another house he "prayed heartily for the family, and gave them some good books, and blessed the household in the name of the Holy Trinity." On his way to Wilmington, North Carolina, he writes in 1811: "I am happy, my heart is pure and my eye is single; but I am sick and weak and in heaviness by reason of suffering and labor. Sometimes I am ready to cry out, 'Lord, take me home to rest!' Courage, my soul!" To this saddlebags apostle, living mostly on the road, often shelterless in rough weather and wild regions, the generous hospitalities of Baltimore seemed too luxurious, and he writes: "O the clover of Baltimore circuit! Ease, ease, not for me! Rather toil, suffering, coarse food, hard lodging, bugs, fleas, and certain et ceteras besides!" At Germantown, Philadelphia, the sick and worn bishop was attended by two eminent physicians, Dr. Benjamin Rush and Dr. Physic, the latter of whom was called "the father of American surgery." Asbury expressed his gratitude for the relief they gave him and inquired of them what he should pay for their services. They answered, "Nothing but an interest in your prayers." At once the bishop said, "As I do not like to be in debt we will pray now;" and he knelt down and prayed that God would bless and reward them for their kindness to him. On a June day in 1811 he writes: "I read Adam Clarke, and am amused as well as instructed. He indirectly unchristianizes all old bachelors. Woe is me! It was not good that Adam should be alone for better reasons than any that Adam Clarke had given!" In 1804 Asbury set down in his Journal the reasons why he never married: "If I should die in celibacy, which I think quite probable, I give the following reasons for what can scarcely be called my choice: I began my public exercises in my seventeenth year; at twenty-one I traveled; at twenty-six I came to America. It had been my intention to return to Europe at thirty years of age, but the war continued and it was ten years before we had a settled, lasting peace. This was no time to marry. At forty-nine I was made bishop. Among the duties imposed upon me by my office was that of traveling extensively, and I could hardly expect to find a woman with grace enough to enable her to live but one week out of fifty-two with her husband. Besides, what right has any man to take advantage of the affections of a woman, make her his wife, and by a voluntary absence subvert the whole order and economy of the marriage state, by separating those whom neither God, nature, nor the requirements of civil society permit to be put asunder? It is neither generous nor just. I may add to this that I had little money, and with this I ministered to the needs of a beloved mother till I was fifty-seven. If I have done wrong I hope God and the sex will forgive me. It is my duty now to bestow the pittance I may have to spare upon the widows and fatherless girls and poor married

men." In 1812, when Asbury heard what had happened to one of his preachers, Rev. Nicholas Snethen, he wrote: "Great Snethen is chaplain to Congress! So; we begin to partake of the honor that cometh from man. Now is our time of danger. O Lord, keep us pure, keep us correct, keep us holy!" Joshua Marsden, of the British Conference, who labored many years in Nova Scotia, in his admirable description of Asbury, wrote: "As a preacher, though not an orator, he was dignified, eloquent, and impressive; his sermons were the result of good sense and sound wisdom, delivered with great authority and gravity, and often attended with a divine unction which made them refreshing as the dews of heaven. His talents as a preacher were respectable, but his chief excellence lay in governing; for this no man was better qualified. He presided with dignity, moderation, and firmness over a large body of men, all of whom are as tenacious of liberty and equal rights as any in the world; and yet each of them submitted to an authority founded upon reason, maintained with inflexible integrity, and exercised only for the good of the whole." Among Asbury's dear friends was Governor Van Cortlandt, of New York State, who was a hearty Methodist, very rich, inheriting much of the old Cortlandt manor, and living in a spacious mansion near the mouth of the Croton River. Besides Bishop Asbury, Lafayette, Washington, Franklin, and Whitefield were entertained there. One of the most pathetic and characteristic entries in Asbury's Journal was on July 19, 1814, in which he tells how the old bishop broke away from the tender affection which wished to detain and nurse him in order to prosecute his journey and his work. "I would not be loved to death," he says, "and so came down from my sick room and took to the road, weak enough. Attentions constant and kindness unceasing have pursued me to this place (Greensburg, Pennsylvania), and now my strength is increasing. I look back upon a martyr's life of toil and privation and pain, and I am ready for a martyr's death. The purity of my intentions, my diligence in the labors to which God has called me, the unknown sufferings I have endured—what are all these? The merit, atonement, and righteousness of Christ alone make my plea!" There ought to be no weaklings, no cowards, no sluggards, nor shirks among the spiritual descendants of such men as Wesley, Coke, and Asbury. This book and *The Heart of Wesley's Journal* ought to be in every Methodist home, side by side. They are truly great books.

Christian Life in the Primitive Church. By ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ, D.D., Ordinary Professor of New Testament Theology in the University of Strasburg. Translated by Rev. GEORGE BREMNER, B.D., and Edited by Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D. Pp. xxxix, 438. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. London: Williams & Norgate. 1904. Price, \$3.

This is one of the Theological Translation Library of the London publishers, Williams & Norgate, whose motto is the apocryphal utterance of Galileo, "E pur si muove" ("Yet it does move"), and who have done for liberal and Unitarian German literature what the famous Presbyterian brothers T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh have done for evangelical. Now the liberals seem to have the field, Clark's Foreign Theological Library having had no additions for some years, though they were never narrow

in their appropriation of the best things in German scholarship. Does this quiescence of the Clark Library mean that theological liberals are more intellectually alert, that they read more books, than conservatives? Professor von Dobschütz is a conservative Ritschlian, and, like too many of the younger scholars of Germany, a disciple of Harnack. He rejects the apostolic authorship of 1 Peter, assigns John's writings to a "John of Asia Minor" who wrote in the early part of the second century, and thinks the Epistle to the Ephesians the effusion of a "profound Christian thinker" who had been influenced by Paul. It is remarkable how easily the German critics and their American imitators pick up "profound Christian thinkers" in postapostolic times to father the most spiritually quickening and original writings of the New Testament, while we know that writings which belong to the second century or thereabouts are comparatively jejune, prolix, lifeless. To the New Testament books these are like a sand heap to Mont Blanc! However, these critical views of Dobschütz are never obtruded, and for the investigation which he has on hand do not affect the great and lasting value of his most interesting and valuable book. He quotes at the start the beautiful description of the moral life of the Christian by Aristides, and places side by side the darker picture of Hermas, and then asks, Which is the truer picture? What was the ethics of early Christianity? How far did the first Christians prove true to the moral teachings of Christ and the apostles? We do not remember now a single book which sets before it this exact task, though, of course, books in church history and in the history of Christian ethics touch this field. (See the literature in the last edition of Schaff, i, 432, ii, 311, 312.) With untiring patience, with ample scholarship, with inner appreciation of the true spirit of Christianity, with impartial judgment on the whole, Dobschütz carries forward his investigation of the life of the primitive Christian churches, first taking up the New Testament, then considering the writings of the first half of the second century, and he comes to the conclusion that on the whole Aristides was right, that Christianity vindicated itself as the only divine religion in its moral transformations, and that it conquered the world by the heavenly dynamic of its holiness and its love. The author treats with discrimination and justice the relation of the early Christians to slavery, to social customs, to asceticism, to riches, to labor, etc. He quotes Hausrath's view, that "to-day, after the gospel has worked in the human heart for eighteen centuries, the most desolate Christian church approaches the ideal of the Sermon on the Mount more closely than the most outstanding of the second century," but thinks that does injustice to the early church. There were grave lapses, but Christianity gave new life to every society which it touched. "This is no imaginary picture," says Dobschütz (p. 371); "every single fact has been supported by documentary evidence. The apologists were thoroughly entitled to represent morality in the Christian churches as Aristides has done. Heathen like Pliny, Lucian, Celsus, were compelled even against their will to witness to the correctness of the picture. The Christians themselves were well aware that it was not sufficient to point to their splendid and marvelous moral teaching if its realiza-

tion in actual practice failed. . . . It is equally clear indeed that the ideal was not always realized. But offenses against it were exceptional, and have less significance, as they awoke at once the moral consciousness of the spiritual leaders and of the congregations." "By their fruits ye shall know them," said the Christ. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, that ye love one another." And Dobschütz thinks that it was the compelling attraction of Christian life and love that won the empire for the cross. "It was as a charitable organization that the Christian church carried to a victorious issue its mighty contest with the Roman empire, the heathen religion, and its own sects" (p. 378). It is not necessary to say with our author that "Christianity did not owe its final victory to superiority of dogma." It did and it did not. *The life sprang from the faith*, and faith in Christ as Saviour had in it the germ of the later dogma of his divinity. Nor was it merely to its higher moral teaching that Christianity owed its victory; for, as the author truly says, Stoicism and Neoplatonism produced fine moral thoughts. "Yet neither of them could enable artisans and old women to lead a truly philosophical life. Christianity could and did; the apologists point triumphantly to the realization of the moral ideal among Christians of every standing. That was due to the power which issued from Jesus Christ and really transformed men. The certainty and confidence of faith based on him, with reliance on God's grace in Jesus Christ, begot in Christians a matchless delight in doing good. Joy in good was more potent than abhorrence of evil. In the midst of an old and dying world this new world springs up with the note of victory running through it: 'If God be with us, who can be against us?' 'And this is the victory which overcometh the world, even your faith'" (p. 379). In the appendix are six scholarly and long notes: 1. On ancient statistics. 2. On slavery among the ancients. 3. On the divine judgment in Corinth. 4. On James, the Lord's brother. 5. On vegetarianism in the ancient world. 6. On the terminology of morality—this last alone almost worth to the New Testament student the price of the book, which closes with complete indices. We only wish that Dr. Morrison had thrown his editorial scissors into one of his Scotch firths when he took up Dobschütz's *Die Urchristlichen Gemeinden: sittengeschichtliche Bilder*, or Bremner's excellent translation, and made no omissions whatever. Why cut out the author's dedication to his friend, Professor Drews, or the valuable note on p. ix of the original which tells us where Hegesippus and Hippolytus placed the golden egg of the church? Nor was there any need of abbreviating the bibliography (p. 264 of original, p. 380 of translation).

MISCELLANEOUS

Doctor Luke of the Labrador. By NORMAN DUNCAN, Professor of English in Washington and Jefferson College. 12mo, pp. 342. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

A story of the Labrador coast, with vivid pictures of the life of its fisher folk, full of hardship, heroism, patience, and simple pathos; a story

of love and crime and tragedy and tenderness. The wild waves foam over its pages and the sea winds flutter its leaves; salt water and salt air from first to last. Here are the words of a Labrador boy coming early under the dangerous fascination of the sea: "When the weather turned civil I would away to the summit of the Watchman—a scamper and a mad climb—to watch the doughty little schooners on their way. And it made my heart swell and flutter to see them dig their noses into the swelling seas—to watch them heel and leap and make the white dust fly—to feel the rush of the wet wind that drove them—to know that the gray path of a thousand miles was every league of the way beset with peril. Brave craft! Stout hearts to sail them! It thrilled me to watch them beating up the sudsy coast, lying low and black in the north, and through the leaden, ice-strewn seas, with the murky night creeping in from the open. I, too, would be the skipper of a schooner, and sail with the best of them! 'A schooner an' a wet deck for me!' thought I." The book closes with the dying of Skipper Tommy, just as a new day, bright, clean, and benignant, is coming up out of the sea. Hear the grateful, good old man: "The Lard gave me work. Blessed be the name of the Lard! The Lard gave me pain. Blessed be the name of the Lard! The Lard gave me love. Blessed be the name of the Lard! The Lard showed himself to me. 'Skipper Tommy,' says the Lard, 'let's you and me be friends. You'll never regret it, boy, if you make friends with me,' says the Lard. Blessed be the name of the Lard!" And he tells how death seems to him: "'Tis like wakin' from a troubled dream, to the sunlight of a new day. The Lard takes our hand and says to us: 'The day is broke. Dream no more, but rise, child o' mine, and come into the sunshine with me!' 'Tis only that, only his gentle touch and the wakin'. Don't you go gettin' scared. 'Tis a lovely thing—that's comin' to you!"

